

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XI

JULY, 1918

NUMBER 3

THE ANABAPTISTS AND MINOR SECTS IN THE REFORMATION

RUFUS M. JONES

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

Parallel with the main current of the Protestant Reformation there ran from the very beginning another powerful current which has always received far less consideration from historians than it deserves. Some have supposed it to be a mis-guided, if not a monstrous, undertaking. Others have considered it one more among the many "lost causes" about which history is more or less silent. Neither of these positions is, however, quite tenable. It was, like Bunker Hill in the American Revolution, "a battle lost but a cause won," since nearly everything which these minor reformers aimed at has since been achieved or is on the way to achievement.

The leaders of this parallel movement were ruthlessly martyred, their followers were exterminated, their books and tracts were suppressed, their aims were slanderously misinterpreted, their brave efforts were as rapidly as possible overwhelmed with oblivion; but strangely enough their ideas have triumphed. Their truths — though they themselves are dead — are marching on, like John Brown's spirit. Their vision of what Christianity should be is much closer to the heart of our own religion today in England and America than is either the theology

of Luther or the dogmatic system of Calvin. There is no occasion to belittle the service of the great reformers, the reformers of folio size, like Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli. They did a monumental piece of work; they changed the course of history decidedly for the better, and they have been given, and rightly so, their place with the immortals. There is, nevertheless, much lumber, sheer dead wood, in their semi-mediæval systems. They carried on many aspects of pre-Reformation Christianity which might profitably have been sloughed off, and they loaded human minds and hearts with some tragic burdens which might well have been spared. It is no doubt easier to see that fact today than it was to see it four hundred years ago, and we ought not to expect at the beginning of a period the critical insight which comes through the cumulative experience of the years.

These neglected reformers — of the quarto or octavo size perhaps — did see on the spot then that much of the wood in the new systems was already dead, that many of the tragic burdens which the reformers were loading on human shoulders were too heavy to be borne, and were in any case unnecessary. They wanted a "root and branch" reformation, a thorough-going reformation, a radical purification and reorganization. Though they belonged to the scholarly class, and came, almost without exception, from the universities, they were in deep sympathy with the people. They thought and spoke for toilers and peasants. They had entered into the meaning of the social struggle and had come under the burden of human suffering; they intensely felt the social wrongs of the world, and they came forth as the champions of the reformation which the common man needed and demanded. They failed in their day to carry through their programme, but it was in the main a noble aspiration, much of it was wisely conceived, historical

experience has confirmed many of the aims embodied in it, and it deserves patient and impartial, if not sympathetic, study.

One of the most interesting historical questions is that concerned with the spiritual pedigree of the movement, or more properly of the movements, for it was not ever, as we shall see, well unified into any single system. There must obviously have been *some* pre-Reformation preparation for it, since it burst forth almost simultaneously at many widely sundered places, in many lands, and it accumulated at once an immense popular volume and momentum. Wherever it appeared it took on, with all its particular variations, striking similarities, at least in its central purpose and its fundamental principles. The leaders plainly had a large stock of ideas and ideals in common. There must have been some background explanation. Unfortunately it is not possible yet to produce definite documentary evidence to prove beyond question that these new groups which formed at the beginning of the Reformation were the direct product of earlier groups of mystics, Waldenses, Wyclifites, Hussites, Brothers of the Common Life, or Spiritual Franciscans.¹ And yet it is an unmistakable fact that there did exist in unbroken succession, especially through the Rhine valley and in Switzerland, hidden groups of "heretics" and mystics. The puritan-minded Waldenses were never suppressed on the continent, as the Lollards never were in England. The writings of the mystics of the fourteenth, and especially the writings of the great Brother of the Common Life, Thomas à Kempis of the fifteenth century, were widely circulated and devotedly read. These books, as we now know, exercised

¹ Ludwig Keller was convinced that his researches established this point, but other scholars, including Dr. Ernst Troeltsch, do not endorse his claim. See especially Keller's *Ein Apostel der Wiedertäufer*. Troeltsch's great work, *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen* (Tübingen, 1912), is a very valuable contribution in this field, and I have carefully re-read the section of it bearing on my subject before writing this article.

a profound influence on Luther, and there is much to indicate that they exerted a still more profound influence upon the popular leaders with whom we are now concerned. The essential reason for thinking so is that the body of ideas in the new movement is uniformly so harmonious and consonant with the teaching and aspirations of these mystics and with the heretical groups which had already suggested the lines of reformation that were needed to restore real, that is, apostolic, Christianity.

Two events woke the quiet, long-suffering successors of the mystics and heretical groups from mere dumb hopes to eager, vivid expectation—the powerful teaching of the humanists and the dynamic message of Luther. It is impossible to miss or ignore the direct influence of the humanists upon the leaders of this common-man's reformation. It is most apparent in the new social and ethical emphasis. They one and all show a revolt from the old theology. It has lost both its interest and its reality for them. Something else more real and more appealing has come into the foreground of their consciousness. They have drawn much closer to the Jesus of the Gospel than had anybody else since St. Francis. They are more attracted to Him and to His wonderful words than to the elaborate metaphysical accounts of His being and nature. They turn eagerly to the positive teachings of this great Master of life as they find them revealed in the New Testament, which the humanists had helped them discover. They learned too from these same humanists how vastly different the Church of their time was from the Church in its pristine apostolic purity and power. Then came Luther's electrifying message of faith and freedom, shaking them entirely awake. They almost all refer to his quick and powerful word. They rose at once to meet it. They thought he was to lead them into a new epoch and be their champion in the work of building a new Church. *The Liberty of a Christian Man* and the

Babylonian Captivity of the Church, as they read them in 1520, seemed like a new revelation from God. They felt that the hour had struck and that the new heaven and the new earth were within hail.

Two pretty clearly marked tendencies appear in this general effort of the period to secure the type of reformation which the common man was striving for, though it must be recognized that the entire undertaking always remained throughout somewhat fluid, uncompact, and unorganized. The two typical tendencies were: (1) in the direction of what is historically denominated "Anabaptism"; and (2) a serious aim to work out a truly spiritual Christianity, winnowed of the accumulations of paganism, superstition, theology, and secularism. We may therefore loosely divide the leaders of the popular movement into "Anabaptists" and "Spiritual Reformers," though the division is not a sharp one, and some leaders do not easily come under either label while others seem to come under both labels. The Anabaptists numerically bulk much larger than the second group, though in historical influence the former are not more important than the latter. The first group of Anabaptists to differentiate and to formulate and express its principles was the Swiss group in and about Zürich and St. Gall. The leaders were young scholars and priests whose hearts, "under the cross," had been made one with the common people. They were genuine shepherds of the flock.

The most important men who led this movement were Conrad Grebel, Felix Manz, William Reublin, Simon Stumpf, and Ludwig Hetzer. They had all been powerfully affected by their reading and study of the Bible, now for the first time truly a book of the people. They began to preach to their flocks a fresh message drawn from the prophets and the Gospel. The popular response was immediate, and they found themselves, without intending it, the champions of a new cause. As Zwingli

moved forward to secure a reformation of the Swiss Churches, these men gladly joined him and were content to follow his leading. They soon discovered, however, that he was moving toward a reformation which was far too restrained and limited to suit their conception of what the times demanded. They engaged in public discussions with him, and found that he was voicing the reforming aims of the nobles and upper class but was unresponsive to the deep needs of the masses whom they represented. Gradually they felt compelled to deviate from the course which Zwingli was steering and to proclaim a more radical programme. They came across the writings of the "new prophets" of the people, Thomas Münzer and Carlstadt, and they deeply sympathized with the aspiration for a more inward religion which these men voiced, but they thoroughly disapproved of Münzer's support of popular insurrection and his passionate appeal for the oppressed to use the sword. They declined to employ the world's way to success and trusted wholly to the inherent power of ideas and to the invisible help of God. What they demanded as the most urgent need of the times was the complete reformation of the Church to make it fit the New Testament. They insisted first of all that the Church of Christ must be "a congregation of believers." Only those, they claimed, who have hearts of faith, spiritual insight, obedient wills, and real religious experience can compose a Christian Church. A mixed multitude of good and bad, of saints and sinners, cannot make a true Church. The historical compromise with the world, the scaling of the Christian standards down to the level of the nominal, secular membership, seemed to them to be the greatest source of the "apostasy" of the Church. They now proposed to wipe the slate clean, to make a new start, and to form a Church consisting only of Christians, only of the faithful. It seemed to them that the custom of baptizing

infants, who from the nature of the case could not exercise faith, was one fertile cause of the degeneracy. It stood in their eyes as the mark of apostasy from Apostolic Christianity, somewhat as circumcision stood out, for St. Paul in the Galatian controversy, as the peculiar mark of Judaistic legalism. If the Church were henceforth to be pure and Christian, then it must have no rites or practices which did not attach directly to personal faith, and it must have no members who had not positively experienced in their own souls a living faith. They had little primary interest in sacraments at best, since their main concern was for a strongly ethical and social Christianity, but they believed that the primitive Christians practised baptism as an outward sign of an inward experience and as a testimony of fellowship in a visible Church. They proposed therefore to restore baptism to this primitive, apostolic function. In 1525 Grebel baptized Blaurock, a devoted Christian man and one of the band of preachers who had accepted the radical attitude. Blaurock thereupon, "in deep fear of God," baptized many others, and a community of "brothers," as they liked to call themselves, began to grow and to differentiate from the main Zwinglian Reformation. These dissenters were given the nickname "Anabaptists," which means re-baptizers, and the name stuck to them and widened out to include almost all types of persons who dissented from the Roman and Reformed Churches. It became the opprobrious label for the entire effort of the common man for a reformation. The Swiss dissenters themselves refused to accept the name or to admit its implication. They declared that they were not "re-baptizers." The baptism which they had received as infants, they claimed, was no baptism at all, since baptism cannot take place without positive personal faith on the part of the recipient. Adult baptism taken in faith as a sign of fellowship in the pure church of Christ

was, in their view, the one and only baptism — not a “second baptism.”

As their aims grew defined, the Anabaptists endeavored (1) to construct a Church entirely on the model of the New Testament, in every particular a copy of the apostolic pattern. (2) This was to be a visible Church, composed only of believers, a community of saints, winnowed and separated from the unbelieving and unspiritual. (3) This state of purity in the Church was to be preserved by a rigorous use of discipline. Those who fall below the Christian standard and become corrupt or contaminated by the world, or who compromise with the world, must be excluded by ban from membership in the Church, that is, there must be a continuous use of the winnowing fan. (4) The Church must be completely severed from all entangling alliance with the state. The Church and State have officially nothing in common. Membership in the former is a free act. There must be no kind of compulsion in spiritual matters. Through faith and experience the Church lives and grows and enlarges its fellowship. It influences the character of those who form the State, but its authority is indirect, not direct. In the sphere of religion the State has no authority; conscience in its relation with God is to be absolutely free and untrammelled. (5) All Christians have the same fundamental rights as the clergy have. There are no classes, no orders, no fixed distinctions. The only differences are differences of gift and function. (6) The movement tended, though more or less unconsciously, to treat the Gospel as “a new law,” to be literally followed and obeyed, very much as was done in the earlier groups of Waldenses and Lollards. Under this influence most branches of the Anabaptists refused to take oaths, set themselves against war, and denied that a Christian is allowed under any circumstances to take human life. With this rigorous literalism they also joined a moral

strictness of life more extreme than that which marked any other section of the Reformation, even that of the Calvinistic churches. (7) They not only proclaimed freedom of conscience; they bore a powerful testimony to the august authority of conscience. They arrived at the conviction that conscience is an inner sanctuary or shechinah of God Himself, and here as nowhere else they believed the voice of the living God is heard. With this exalted sense of an inner connection with the divine, they suffered and died for what seemed to them eternal truth and everlasting righteousness, and in doing so they gave a new note of emphasis to the moral worth of conscience.

Two very powerful leaders, of German origin and education, soon threw in their lot with the Swiss dissenters and stood out at once as the prophets of the new movement, Baltazar Hübmaier, born near Augsburg in 1480, and Hans Denck, a Bavarian, born about 1495. Hübmaier was a Doctor of Theology, one of the best scholars of his time, a humanist, a mystic, a powerful preacher, a high-minded, pure-hearted, brave man, and finally, in 1528, a martyr. His watchword, used on the title-page of his little books, was "Truth is immortal," and he maintained, even in the face of death, that *truth ultimately wins* in any contest. He accepted in full measure Luther's claim that faith—the soul's attitude of trust and confidence in God—is the fundamental basis of Christianity; only he went farther with the principle than Luther did and carried it out more consistently. Nothing in the sphere of religion can be accomplished, he held, without insight, faith, obedience, effort, conformity of heart and will with God. Religion must be from first to last a spiritual affair. Rites, ceremonies, magical or sacerdotal performances, cannot alter the ethical and inherent facts of life. "God," he declared in his *Apology*, "will have none of our Baal-cries." With

this central position fixed, Hübmaier labored valiantly to secure a reformation of the Church consonant with the spiritual character of apostolic Christianity. "I believe and confess" he wrote, "a holy catholic Church, which is a communion of saints, a brotherhood of devout and believing men."² Very large numbers were convinced by Hübmaier's preaching, and when his lips were sealed by the fagots in Vienna he had already carried his interpretation of religion into many lives both in Swiss and Austrian towns.³

Denck belongs very definitely among the "Spiritual Reformers"; but he was for a time identified with the Anabaptists and he undoubtedly exerted a very strong influence upon the movement in its early stage, though as his insight deepened and his views matured, his interpretation of Christianity took a broader outlook and a more universal aspect than most Anabaptists were ready for. For more than a year — September, 1525, to October, 1526 — Denck was in Augsburg endeavoring to organize and direct the popular movement toward reform, striving to check fanatical tendencies, opposing literalists and extremists, and putting forth strenuous efforts to deepen and spiritualize the throngs of enthusiastic "seekers."

Before the Anabaptist leaders had any opportunity to clarify their aims or to formulate their principles, the world took fright at the potential dangers of the movement and began suppressing the prominent exponents of it and endeavoring to obliterate it utterly. The uprising of the German peasants in 1525, in the hope of securing for themselves a measure of economic and social justice, gave the ruling class and the nobles a vivid sense of what might happen if these submerged peoples awakened, *found themselves*, and became an organized and directed

² Hübmaier's Twelve Articles of Faith.

³ It is estimated that six thousand persons became Anabaptists in and around Nikolsburg where Hübmaier preached.

force. Luther threw all the power of his pen, voice, and personality against the cause of the peasants. He wrote: "Whoever can should knock down, strangle, and stab insurgents, privately or publicly, and think nothing so venomous, pernicious, and devilish as an insurgent." He declared that those who died fighting against the peasants were "true martyrs before God," and that those who perish on the peasant side are "everlasting hell-brands."⁴ The long-suffering peasants, driven to the limit of endurance by their intolerable condition and inspired by the hope which the dawning reformation gave them, made their assault against the immovable wall of German authority, and failed. Münzer, the spiritual champion of their aspirations, went to death with them.

The early Anabaptist leaders, most of whom owed much to the dynamic, if not wisely directed zeal of Münzer, disapproved of the appeal to force and set themselves against insurrection. The Zürich society of "brothers" wrote to Münzer in September, 1524, urging him not to resort to violence. They say: "The Gospel and its followers should not be guarded by the sword, neither shall they so guard themselves, as, by what we hear from the Brethren, ye assume and pretend to be right. Truly-believing Christians are sheep in the midst of wolves, sheep ready for the slaughter; they must be baptized in fear and in need, in tribulation and death, that they may be tried to the last, and enter the fatherland of eternal peace, not with carnal but with spiritual weapons. They use neither the sword nor war."⁵ In spite of this gentle attitude, which beyond question characterized the main current of the popular reformation, all existing authorities, both of Church and State, were seized with intense antipathy toward these spiritual

⁴ Luther's tract, *Wider die Mordischen und Reubischen Rotter der Bauern*.

⁵ Letter written by Grebel to Münzer.

strivings of the common man, rose in might, and stamped it out in blood and fire. All the early leaders were either killed outright or so severely treated that death overtook them prematurely. The members of the group of "brothers" were dealt with as pests and outcasts, harried, imprisoned, banished, forced to live like beasts in dens and caves of the earth. It is impossible to tell what would have been the social and spiritual effect of this popular movement—which apparently, judging from its enthusiastic beginnings, would have swept in the common people of all countries—if it had been allowed to develop and realize its aims.⁶ Its first leaders were honest, sincere, unselfish men. They had no hostile intent. They sought no personal power or aggrandizement. They had no spirit of hate. They were fired with no class-animus. One of Denck's disciples, Hans Langenmantel, said: "The highest command of God is Love. Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself." They denied that it is right to try to gain spiritual ends by violence and sword. They trusted everything to the immortal power of truth, to the transforming force of ideas. They meant to inaugurate a Church which would expand and become the Kingdom of God on earth. They found a Golgotha instead.

The fury of the persecution, the appalling method of answering their dumb aspirations, produced at once a new type of leader and drove many of the Anabaptists toward fanaticism. Melchior Hoffman of Strasburg and his disciples are a different type from those whom I have considered. Always inclined to literalism, the movement now focussed upon a fervid expectation of the fulfilment of millennial hopes. Hoffman became the prophet of an intense chiliasm, and even proclaimed that

⁶ Even in the face of the terrific persecution that came down upon it as soon as it began, there were many thousands of Anabaptists in Middle Europe, and it has been estimated that thirty thousand were put to death in Holland alone.

the sword might be used to hasten the expected Kingdom of God. His Dutch disciples, Jan Matthys and Jan Bockelson, pushed the fanaticism of the radical wing to its wildest limit, and gave to the world by the spectacle of the Münster kingdom, a reason for the horror of Anabaptism and an excuse, after the fact, for its method of thorough extermination.⁷

A remnant of the original stock survived the double tragedy of persecution and fanaticism. The followers of Jacob Huter, a Tyrolese Anabaptist, who worked out a very interesting type of communistic society, succeeded in escaping from the annihilating persecutions of the Tyrol and migrated into Moravia. Eventually Huter was martyred. His last despairing cry is touching: "We know that it is not allowable to forbid the earth to us, for the earth is the Heavenly Father's." Huter's Communities were driven from place to place and reduced in numbers, but they were never wholly eradicated or suppressed. The Mennonites form another group of survivors. They owe their name and many of their characteristics to Menno Simon, born in West Friesland about 1496. He set himself to winnowing out the follies and fanaticisms of the Dutch Anabaptists, and he succeeded in organizing a strong branch of the movement, which has survived to the present time. He carried a puritan spirit into his group of followers, a determination to take the commands of Christ literally, and a tendency to form "a peculiar people," distinguished by dress, manners, separation from public affairs, and absence of ordained or salaried ministry. Sporadic individuals and even groups of Anabaptists escaped the violent Protestant and Catholic persecutions in most of the continental countries, and a large number, in one way or another, got into England. They merged with the

⁷ Hans Hut, a disciple of Münster, also preached apocalyptic hopes, though, unlike Hoffman, he remained non-resistant.

Lollards, and in some cases managed to escape the fires of Smithfield. They helped to form the numerous groups of heretics and dissenters which swarmed during the freer time of the English Commonwealth. They formed also the early nucleus of the famous Baptist Societies out of which the Baptists sprang.

The other fundamental tendency, which I have called the aim at a "spiritual reformation," was even more viscous or fluid, less compact and unified, than was the Anabaptist movement. One reason for the lack of organization and solidification is to be found in the strong mystical aspect of this reforming movement. Its leaders were hostile to systems. They were in revolt against dogmas, and they were equally opposed to the tyranny of authoritative, State-controlled, ecclesiastical institutions. They wanted to escape alike from a Hellenized and a Romanized Christianity. They saw no way to solve the problem without a complete shift of emphasis from the outward to the inward. The visible Church had tightened itself around the human spirit until no free area or independent sphere of activity seemed left for man's soul in its own right. These minor prophets of the Reformation were primarily prophets of the soul, champions of the free spirit. They had no architectonic genius. They felt no interest in rearing either structures of logic or institutional structures. Like Copernicus, they proposed a new centre, and their new centre was man's soul. They were always thinking and writing about the Church; but it was from first to last an invisible Church about which they were concerned, not the visible and empirical one. It is in this point that they differ most from the Anabaptists, with whom they had close sympathy and often warm fellowship. The Anabaptists were eager to create a new visible Church, and they took the written word of Scripture as their charter for it. The "Spiritual Re-

formers" accepted neither of those positions. They found the ultimate basis of religion in the Word of God, the Light of God, revealed in the interior life of man, and they thought of the Church as a spiritual organism of illuminated and inwardly guided persons. They were deeply read in the books of the German and Flemish mystics — Eckhart, Tauler, Ruysbroeck, *Theologia Germanica*, the writings of "the Friends of God," and *The Imitation of Christ*, but they were almost as much influenced by the Humanists, especially by Erasmus. They shared his faith in human freedom, his strong emphasis on the ethical aspect of the true Christian life, his dislike of theological dogma, and his appreciation of the pure and simple "gospel." They are mystics, but they are distinctly a new type of mystics. Through their dislike for theology and metaphysics they allowed the speculative element, which is so large a feature of fourteenth-century mysticism, to fall away, and they consequently made the positive, affirmative way of relationship with God much more prominent than the *via negativa* of the earlier mystics. In short, they were more interested in direct experience than they were in logic.

So far as one can locate any "originator" of the movement — which, after all, stands out very much like Melchizedek, without historical "father or mother" — Thomas Münzer was the first person in the Reformation period to make the living Voice or Word of God in the soul the basis of religion. The interior Teacher seemed to him the source of truth and the guide of life. He was unfortunately a loosely organized individual, lacking in balance and capable of being stirred to fanaticism. But he planted his idea in the heart of Ludwig Hetzer, translator of the Hebrew Prophets, and Hans Denck, the humanist school-master of St. Sebald School in Nuremberg, and it came to resurrection-life and power in

sounder and saner men than himself. Denck, though he is often reckoned an Anabaptist, and though for a period he endeavored to shape the development of the Anabaptists in the direction of his own ideals, belongs more distinctly in this second group. Johann Bunderlin, born in Linz, a town of Upper Austria about 1495, Christian Entfelder, who first appears as pastor of a flock in Moravia in 1527, and Sebastian Franck, born at Donauwörth in Schwabia in 1499, are other early exponents of the spiritual ideals. Caspar Schwenckfeld, born at Liegnitz in Lower Silesia in 1489, was more distinctly interested than these other leaders in the formation of a visible society—those of “the middle way”—and he created a brotherhood that has survived to the present time; but his ideas and ideals were of the general type which characterize the aim at a “spiritual” reform. Sebastian Castellio, a French humanist and opponent of Calvin, born near Geneva in 1515, and Dirck Coornhert, a prominent Dutch scholar, born in Amsterdam in 1522, are two of the noblest interpreters of these spiritual ideals and aspirations.

They were all strongly individualistic, and they felt too little the importance of the help of a visible community. They had a naïve, uncritical, and unquestioning faith in inner divine guidance and personal revelation. “The Kingdom of God,” Denck says, “is in you, and he who searches for it outside himself will never find it; for apart from God no one can either seek or find God, but he who seeks God already in truth has Him”; and again, “He who does not know God from God himself does not ever know Him.”⁸

Franck is a still more confident apostle of the inner way. Many, he says, know and teach only what they have picked up and gathered “without having experienced it in the deeps of themselves.” Hearing people read

⁸ From Denck's two tracts, *Was geredet sei*, etc., and *Vom Gesetz Gottes*.

and talk about God is "all a dead thing." The real Christian "must go inside and have the experience for himself."⁹

But in spite of the fact that they seem so individualistic and concerned with personal experience in their own souls, they are emphatically *social* in their sympathies. Like the Anabaptists, they are interested in the common man. They all alike make *love*, actual human love, the mark of fellowship with Christ. They show a fresh interest in man for his own sake. They all, with the exception of Schwenckfeld, deny the depravity of man and they refuse utterly to accept the dogma of "unfree will." They realize that human life is a frail and tragic affair, but it is, nevertheless, big with spiritual possibilities, and the most splendid fruit of life is love. "To hate everything that hinders love," is Denck's ideal of life.¹⁰ Castellio declares that Christ's way always means love. "You [meaning Calvin] may return to Moses if you will, but for us others Christ has come."¹¹ Love, he constantly insists, is the supreme badge of any true Christianity; the traits of the beatitudes in a person's life are surer evidence that he belongs to Christ's family than is the fact that he holds orthodox opinions on obscure questions of belief. Franck has expressed as well as any of the group, the way they felt about the invisible Church: "The true Church is not a separate mass of people, not a particular sect to be pointed out with the finger, not confined to one time or place; it is rather a spiritual and invisible body of all the members of Christ, born of God, of one mind, spirit, and faith, but not gathered in any one external city or place. It is a Fellowship, seen with the spiritual eye and by the inner man. It is the assembly and communion of all truly God-fearing, good-hearted, new-born persons in all the world,

⁹ Franck's *Paradoxa*, Vorrede, sec. 13. and *passim*.

¹⁰ *Vom Gesetz Gottes*, p. 12.

¹¹ Castellio's *Contra Libellum Calvini*.

bound together by the Holy Spirit in the peace of God and the bonds of love—a Communion outside of which there is no salvation, no Christ, no God, no comprehension of Scripture, no Holy Spirit, and no Gospel. I belong to this Fellowship. I believe in the Communion of saints, and I am in this Church, let me be where I may; and therefore I no longer look for Christ in ‘lo heres’ or ‘lo theres.’”¹² This Church, which the Spirit is building through the ages and in all lands, is, once more, like the experience of the individual Christian, entirely an inward affair. “Love is the one mark and badge of Fellowship in it.”¹³ No outward forms of any sort seem to him necessary for membership in this true Church. “External gifts and offices make no Christian; and just as little does the standing of the person, or locality, or time, or dress, or food, or anything external. The Kingdom of God is neither prince nor peasant, food nor drink, hat nor coat, here nor there, yesterday nor tomorrow, baptism nor circumcision, nor anything whatever that is external, but peace and joy in the Holy Spirit, unalloyed love out of a pure heart and good conscience and an unfeigned faith.”¹⁴

The Kingdom of God, as they hold, is a *kingdom of experience*, and they want every feature and detail of the religious life to spring out of experience and to assist its enlargement. “As often,” Schwenckfeld writes, “as a new warrior comes to the heavenly army, as often as a poor sinner repents, the body of Christ becomes larger, the King more splendid, His kingdom stronger, His might more perfect.”¹⁵

All these men have but the slenderest interest in sacraments. Sacraments have become for them what circumcision was for St. Paul when he wrote, “neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but

¹² Paradoxa, Vorrede, sec. 8.

¹³ Ibid., sec. 9.

¹⁴ Ibid., sec. 45.

¹⁵ Schwenckfeld's Schriften II, p. 290.

a new creation." Schwenckfeld treats this matter more profoundly than any of the others. He meditated long and deeply upon the question, studying the New Testament both broadly and minutely, while at the same time he gave much thought to the fundamental nature of the religious life. He took Judas as his test case. He argued that if baptism and the supper were efficacious in themselves, then Judas, who received the supper from the Lord himself, would have been saved by it. If the bread and wine were changed into actual body and blood of Christ, then he must have eaten of Christ and partaken of His divine nature; but no corresponding change of spirit appears in him. He came out from the supper and immediately revealed an evil spirit. Schwenckfeld finds the key to Christ's teaching on spiritual life in the Johannine account of eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood. This assimilation of Christ is for him not a figure, not a symbol, but a central fact. The risen and glorified Christ, the incorruptible life-giving substance of the God-Man, is the essential, necessary source of spiritual life for men. He must become the actual food of the soul. Not on rare occasions but continually, the true nature of Christ must be received and assimilated into the inner substance of our human spirits. No symbol can be a substitute for that actual experience: "God must Himself, apart from all external means, through Christ touch the soul, speak in it, work in it, if we are to experience salvation."¹⁶ The Church which these "reformers" were endeavoring to create was thought of as a communion or fellowship of persons who were drawn together and united by their intimate spiritual relation with the living Christ. It was a Church after the Spirit, and not an imperial institution possessed of magical authority, employing mysterious sacraments, or holding a final deposit of infallible doctrine. It was to be an

¹⁶ Schwenckfeld's *Schriften* I, p. 768 b.

organism rather than an organization. "No outward unity or uniformity," Schwenckfeld wrote, "either in doctrine or ceremonies or rules or sacraments, can make a Christian Church; but inner unity of Spirit, of heart, soul, and conscience in Christ and in the knowledge of Him, a unity in love and faith, does make a Church of Christ."¹⁷

Jacob Boehme, born in Silesia in 1575, more completely than any other single continental interpreter, gave a many-sided expression to the faith and aspiration of these spiritual leaders.¹⁸ He is the culmination of the movement. There are many other strands of influence in Boehme, especially the theosophical and alchemic ideas derived from Agrippa, Paracelsus, and Weigel. This latter stock of inheritance proved a heavy weight to this great tragic, but surely divinely inspired, mystic. The barbarous terminology, the baffling symbolisms, and the literary limitations of this Silesian prophet, were always a tremendous handicap; but in spite of all the obstacles, difficulties, and hindrances a real heavenly vision and a living message break through and get revealed in Boehme's books. His most important permanent contribution to Christianity is to be found in his interpretation of what he calls the *process of salvation as a way of life*. Here he is unmistakably "a spiritual reformer." He will not put up with schemes or notions. He sets himself as strongly against the substitution of doctrines of salvation for an experienced process of salvation as Luther did against the substitution of works for faith. "Thou thyself," he says, "must go through Christ's whole journey and enter wholly into his process."¹⁹ He opposes the Protestant tendency to make the Bible the basis of reformed religion — he calls that another form of "Babel-building," which does not reach all the way to

¹⁷ *Schriften* II, p. 785.

¹⁸ The influence of Schwenckfeld is most marked in Boehme.

¹⁹ True Repentance.

God. The written letter-word is no true substitute for the living Word of God in a man's soul. Theological "opinions" are only "mental idols." The "immortal seed of God" must come to birth in the soul, and Christ must *live and operate* within. Boehme once more, like his predecessors, is a builder of the invisible Church. He makes nothing of sacraments. He turns inward rather than outward. He separates religion wholly from State connection. He wants a Christianity of prophets instead of one of priests, and he calls men away from logical systems to personal experience.

The writings of nearly all these men reached England and were read by kindred spirits in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. John Everard is the first scholar of importance who shows a familiarity with the body of ideas and the type of Church set forth in the little books of the spiritual reformers on the continent. He was born in 1575, the year Boehme was born; he was a master of arts and doctor of divinity from Clare College, Cambridge. He was a student of the great mystics, and later in life — after he was fifty — he translated tracts by Sebastian Franck and Hans Denck and Castellio's edition of *The Golden Book of German Divinitie*. Everard's later sermons, printed in *The Gospel Treasury Opened*, give the same general interpretation of Christianity which his continental forerunners give. He was, before everything else, a good man. He was too a man of undoubted depth and power, and he shows both style and humor. Though so often imprisoned that King James I suggested that his name should be changed from Everard [Everout] to "Dr. Never-out," yet his influence was great, and he is almost certainly the first man in England to hold and teach in any impressive way the views of the spiritual reformers. He had important disciples and many successors. The most noted of the disciples was Giles Randall, another translator of spiritual

and mystical books. Francis Rous, Peter Sterry, John Saltmarsh, and William Dell are good examples of the kind of successors whom Everard had.

Meantime other developments were under way which carried the ideas of the spiritual reformers forward into the popular consciousness more extensively than did the books and sermons of these Cambridge and Oxford scholars. Groups of the common people formed into little societies, and worked out in practice, in quiet, out-of-the-way places, the ideals of these teachers. Attempts of this sort were often made in Germany, where they were generally soon suppressed. In Holland they were much more successful, and in that country, where a semi-freedom of conscience was allowed, small sects flourished. The most important of these independent sects were the societies of the Collegiants, who held the fundamental ideas of the spiritual reformers, with the added belief that the present existing Church is only an interim-church, and that God will soon send a new apostle, supernaturally endowed and equipped, to be the beginner, the founder, of the true Church of Christ. For this event they looked and waited, and thus were called "Seekers." They held that no one had the efficacious authority and power to administer sacraments or to be the bearer of an authoritative ministry-message. They therefore met in silence and waited for the Spirit to direct them. They looked after their own poor, watched carefully over the moral life—the "walk and conversation"—of their membership. They were socially minded and made love and fellowship the marks of their communion. They were opposed to oaths, and to the taking of human life, and in other ways they showed their connection with the common man's reformation in the sixteenth century. During the period of the English Commonwealth numerous groups of similar sects appeared in England. They had strong, substantial members, and their leaders—for

they had unordained leaders — were able men and excellent guides. Many other sects swarmed as the degree of freedom increased. There were groups of the Family of Love, who were followers of the mystic, Henry Nicholas, born in Westphalia in 1501. There were Ranters, who were pantheists and frequently were morally loose and antinomian. In the years between 1646 and 1661 all the writings of Jacob Boehme were translated into English, and now became a positive and powerful force, profoundly influencing such intellectual men as Sir Isaac Newton and John Milton,²⁰ and forming the basic religious conceptions of many less noted persons. All these lines, including the groups of Anabaptists, converge and receive their consummate expression in the Society of Friends, which under the leadership of George Fox spread throughout the English counties between 1648 and 1691, the latter date being the year of George Fox's death.

More important, however, than the formation of any religious organization was the silent propagation of truths and ideas which spread across the world as winged seeds fly abroad in the autumn. The contagion of thought from mind to mind, from person to person, without any visible organization, carried these ideals broadcast. They became winnowed of chaff as time sifted them, and they gained in weight and value as they lost their capricious and erratic aspects. They heightened as they received interpretation at the hands of wise and balanced thinkers, and gradually they won the standing which their discoverers could never succeed in giving them. Philosophical movements unconsciously coöperated toward a preparation of groups of people of ideals similar to those of the spiritual reformers. Social and political forces also became their allies. The religious and political experiments in the American colonies assisted greatly in shaping thought in the same direction, and the revolutions

²⁰ See Bailey's *Milton and Jacob Boehme* (New York, 1914).

carried through by the people in America and in France helped immensely to establish the principle of free conscience, separation of Church and State, the inalienable right of a man to be religious in his own way, while the unorganized but irresistible forces of literature in Europe and America, especially from Wordsworth's time onwards, worked silently and powerfully to emphasize inward religion — the religion of the Spirit — and to make dogma and ecclesiasticism less important. We find ourselves at last in a world wholly changed from that which the great reformers, the major reformers, endeavored to make. Their ideals are not our ideals. Their conception of the Church is largely dead or dying. We are, it must be admitted, not in the world of the spiritual reformers, but at the same time their ideals are much more nearly our ideals, their spirit is kindred with ours, and if they could become *revenant*, they would feel at home with us now and would join heartily in spiritual communion and fellowship in any of our live, active, forward-looking church-groups today.

EARLY FREE-THINKING SOCIETIES IN AMERICA

WOODBRIIDGE RILEY

VASSAR COLLEGE

The rise and fall of early free-thinking societies in America offers a picture of considerable interest. The background is that of eighteenth-century deism—with the neutral tints of unbelief; the high lights are furnished by the fires of the French Revolution, the shadows by the dark fires of reaction. Across this canvas march many figures—rationalists like Franklin and Washington, ardent innovators like Jefferson, and a host of lesser characters—Frenchmen like Genêt and his Jacobins, Anglo-Americans like Paine and Houston, plain Americans like Elihu Palmer, with his *Principles of Nature*, English reformers like Robert Owen and his sons with their liberalizing communism; and ever opposing this army of radicals, the conservative elements—heads of colleges, leaders of the bar, and, as particular defenders of the faith, the clergy of New England.¹

¹ The general histories of liberal thought fail to do justice to this subject. J. B. Derry, *A History of Freedom of Thought*, London, 1913, is an excellent short history, but offers only one pertinent reference, regarding political disabilities in Maryland. John Cairns, *Unbelief in the 18th Century*, Edinburgh, 1881, has nothing on the United States. A. S. Farrar, *A Critical History of Free Thought*, New York, 1879, is extreme in its statements. For example, p. 199 refers to Paine's *Age of Reason* as "that infidel work by which his name has gained an unenviable notoriety . . . he gave expression in coarse Saxon words to thoughts which were passing through many hearts." J. M. Robertson, *A Short History of Free Thought*, 3d edition, London, 1915, contains a valuable chapter on "Early Free Thought in the United States" from Franklin and Paine and Jefferson, to Palmer, Houston, and Priestley. Too much confidence perhaps is here put in Moncure Conway's *Life of Thomas Paine*, New York, 1893. Fuller accounts of the beliefs of Franklin and Priestley may be found in my *American Philosophy, The Early Schools*, New York, 1907, pp. 229-265 and 396-406.

From the conservative American side Robert Baird's *Religion in the United States of America*, Edinburgh, 1844, presents an overdrawn picture: "Infidelity," he says, "has descended to the lower ranks, the purlieus, where it finds its proper aliment, the ignorant and vicious" (op. cit. p. 650).

The first agitation against free-thinking societies was largely due to the implications of the word "infidelity," as carried down from our Revolution days:

"There stood the infidel of modern breed,
Blest vegetation of infernal seed,
Alike no Deist, and no Christian, he;
But from all principle, all virtue free."²

So ran the doggerel description given by President Dwight of Yale College. He added that in New England the name "infidel" proverbially denotes an immoral character.³ Now as his clerical colleague, Jedidiah Morse, explained, the duty of the clergy was to warn their parishioners that a spirit of license and of French infidelity was abroad which could be repressed only by a strenuous and combined effort.⁴

This advice had political implications. Thus a charge was made by the author of *The Hamiltoniad*, that every reasoner in the cause of the people was denounced by the royal Junto of New England as a Jacobin, an infidel, and a republican villain.⁵ He added that in New England the Tories are reviving the hackneyed theme that religion is in danger because Mr. Jefferson in his political capacity lets it alone.⁶ Now Jefferson, along with Tom Paine and Cooper, son-in-law of Joseph Priestley,⁷

² Timothy Dwight, *Triumph of Infidelity*, p. 31, New Haven, 1778, dedicated to Voltaire.

³ *Travels in New York and New England*, 1,372, New Haven, 1821-23.

⁴ Henry Adams, *History of the United States During the First Administration of Thomas Jefferson*, p. 78, New York, 1890.

⁵ Anthony Pasquin, *The Hamiltoniad, or An Extinguisher for the Royal Faction of New England*, p. 25, Boston, 1804.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 42, note.

⁷ Priestley, the English chemist, while in Northumberland, Pa., had published an addition to his *Observation on the Increase of Infidelity*, London, 1776. Despite its title this book was not illiberal. Written by the great Unitarian leader, it attacked "the corrupt system of Christianity" in Europe and added: "But happily, in this country, the Church has no alliance with the State, every person being allowed to worship God in whatever manner he pleases." *Observations*, Preface, pp. x, xi.

had been called one of the three doubting Thomases.⁸ But "the philosophical chief of Monticello" who had called the clergy "hierophants of superstition" was not the only one of the Revolutionary leaders suspected of laxity.⁹ Benjamin Franklin had been thought unsafe by George Whitefield in spite of his discreet reply to that evangelist,¹⁰ while apprehensions existed even as regards the father of his country. Replying to the solicitous inquiry of the church of Kingston concerning his eternal welfare, Washington, in a little-known letter, answered in a way that gave slight satisfaction to his interrogators but was at least a model reply as to one's private beliefs:

"Gentlemen:

I am happy in receiving this public mark of the esteem of the Minister, Elders, and Deacons of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of Kingston.

Convinced that our religious liberties were as essential as our civil, my endeavors have never been wanting to encourage and promote the one while I have been contending for the other—also I am highly flattered by finding that my efforts have met the approbation of so respectable a body.

In return for your kind concern for my temporal and eternal happiness, permit me to assure you that my wishes are reciprocal—and that you may be enabled to hand down your religion,

⁸ Seth Payson, *Proofs of the Real Existence and Dangerous Tendency of Illuminism*, p. 53; New Haven, 1802.

⁹ Jefferson indeed had gone so far as to declare that "it does no injury for my neighbor to say there are twenty gods or no god." Adams, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

¹⁰ Franklin's letter of 6 June, 1753, to Whitefield is very non-committal: "The faith you mention has certainly its use in the world. . . . The worship of God is a duty. . . . Your great master thought much less of these outward appearances." Works (ed. Jared Sparks), 7, 75-76, Philadelphia, 1840. The following letter, often quoted, is evidently not authentic. It is not given in Sparks, nor in the Bigelow, Ford, or Smyth editions. In 1764 Franklin is alleged to have written to Whitefield: "That Being, who gave me existence, and through almost three-score years has been continually showering his favours upon me; whose very chastisements have been blessings to me; can I doubt that he loves me? And if he loves me, can I doubt that he will go on to take care of me, not only here but hereafter? This to some may seem presumption; to me it appears the best-grounded hope; hope of the future built on experience and the past." Franklin, Works.

pure and undefiled, to a Posterity worthy of their ancestors, is the fervent prayer of,

Gentlemen,

Your most obed. servant,

GO. WASHINGTON.

KINGSTON

16th Novr. 1782." ¹¹

It has been observed by a sympathetic historian of free thought, that this habit of reticence or dissimulation among American public men was confirmed by the treatment meted out to Thomas Paine.¹² It might be added that a complete billingsgate of bigotry could be compiled from the epithets applied to the author of the *Age of Reason*—atheist, blasphemer, deist, infidel; such terms by the reaction of resentment led subsequently to what clearly became a canonization of this apostle of free thought in the colonies. From the founding of the Theophilanthropical Society to the time of Lincoln's early political career, from the Hall of Science in New York City to the log cabin on the Indiana frontier, Paine was tremendously admired and had an enormous number of followers.¹³ And the heterodoxy of political leaders was accentuated by the excitement due to the "French craze." As one annalist expressed it, the establishment of American independence was not effected without the moral contamination always the result of protracted wars; licentiousness both in conduct and sentiment had followed the footsteps of liberty.¹⁴ More particularly, French infidelity was connected with French Jacobinism, and the tree of liberty, as well as the liberty cap, were considered by many as the outward and visible signs of the demoralization wrought by the coming of Genêt and his followers.¹⁵

¹¹ From a photographic copy of the letter restored to the above church by De Witt Roosa, 1887.

¹² J. M. Robertson, *A Short History of Free Thought*, 1,322.

¹³ Cf. Herndon and Weik, *Lincoln*, p. 439, Chicago, 1889.

¹⁴ Ebenezer Baldwin, *Annals of Yale College*, p. 145, New Haven, 1838.

¹⁵ Dwight, *Travels*, 1,32.

There was now raised "the warwhoop of the pulpit" against the French Revolution as a deliberate attack upon the Church and the creeds. This attack was exposed in a flood of scarehead discourses. The series may be begun with the Reverend Joseph Lathrop's *A Sermon on the Dangers of the Times from Infidelity and Immorality, and Especially from a Lately Discovered Conspiracy against Religion and Government*.¹⁶ In these American States, narrates Lathrop, there has for many years and more especially since our late Revolution been a visible tendency to infidelity. The great accession of foreigners has had a most unfriendly effect on the religion of the country. Most of these are men of fortune, learning, and address, but of licentious principles and dissolute morals. France is filled with atheists. An awful conspiracy against religion has lately been detected by Mr. John Robinson of Edinburg. He shows that the principles of the Illuminati are such as these: there is no supreme independent being, no moral government of the universe, no future existence. Of these societies, Robinson says there are great numbers scattered over Europe, some in England, several in America. His statement is made as the societies stood in 1786. In what parts of America they are formed, he gives no intimation; we choose to believe not in the United States.¹⁷

¹⁶ Springfield [Mass.], 1798.

¹⁷ Lathrop, *Sermon on the Dangers, Etc.*, pp. 12-17. See also Lathrop's *Collected Sermons*, Boston, 1812. The following literary rarities may be found in the New York Public Library as selected from the Paul Leicester Ford donation: William Brown, *An Oration spoken at Hartford, July 4, 1799*. Joseph Lathrop, *A Sermon on the Dangers of the Times from Infidelity and Immorality, and Especially from a lately Discovered Conspiracy against Religion and Government*, Springfield [Mass.], Sept., 1798. Jedidiah Morse, *A Sermon delivered May 9, 1798, the Day recommended for Solemn Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer*, Boston, 1798. Same, *A Sermon preached at Charlestown, November 29, 1798, with Appendix on French intrigue in the United States*, Boston, 1798. Same, *A Sermon exhibiting the Present Dangers and Consequent Duties of the Citizens of the United States of America*, Charlestown, April 25, 1799, the Day of the National Fast, Charlestown, printed, 1799 [Hartford Reprint]. Elijah Parish, *An Oration delivered at Byfield, July 4, 1799*. John C. Smith, *An Oration pronounced at Sharon, July 4, 1798*. William L. Smith, *An Oration, 4 July, 1796*, Charlestown, S.C. David Tappan, *A Discourse delivered in the Chapel of Harvard College, June 19, 1798, occasioned by the approaching departure of the Senior Class from the University*, Boston, 1798.

Lathrop's complacent belief was to be speedily shaken. In the same year, on the day set apart for "Solemn Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer," the Reverend Jedidiah Morse began his protracted assault upon the Jacobin societies, upon Volney's *Ruins*, and upon the French Grand Orient with its affiliated American branches. These sermons at that time furnished a veritable public sensation. People had grown tired of the old hell-fire doctrines and attacks like those of John Wesley upon deists as "heirs of damnation." But here was a subject of real excitement, and the religious leaders made the most of it. Robinson's rather dubious work was again used as the chief source of information. The abuse of our rulers and clergy, explains Morse, is due to a deep-laid and extensive plan, which has for many years been in operation in Europe. To this plan we may trace that torrent of irreligion which threatens to overwhelm the world. This plan is now unveiled in John Robinson's *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against all the Religions and Governments of Europe*. Here we are informed that a society which calls themselves the Illuminated has existed for more than twenty years past in Germany. Their principles are avowedly atheistical; they abjure Christianity, justify suicide, declare death an eternal sleep, advocate sensual pleasures, call patriotism and loyalty prejudices, declaim against property and in favor of liberty and equality, decry marriage and advocate a promiscuous intercourse among the sexes. This society has secretly extended its branches through a great part of Europe and even into America.¹⁸ The aim of the society is to acquire the direction of education, of church manage-

¹⁸ Jedidiah Morse, A Sermon delivered . . . May 1798 . . . the Day . . . for Solemn Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer, pp. 18-21, Boston, 1798. Cf. note, p. 21. Robinson says, "The order of Illuminati took its rise among the Free Masons, but is a vile and pestiferous scion grafted of the stock of simple Masonry." Morse adds, "Judging from the characters which compose the Masonic Fraternity in America, at the head of which stands the immortal Washington . . . this heaven has not found its way into our American lodges."

ment, of the professorial chair, and of the pulpit, to bring their opinions into fashion by every art and to spread them among young people by the help of young writers. They strive to get under their influence the reading and debating societies and reviewers, journalists or editors of newspapers and other periodical publications, the booksellers and postmasters. From their private papers, which have been discovered and are now published, it appears that as early as 1786 they had several societies in America. Doubtless the *Age of Reason* and other works of that unprincipled author, as they proceeded from the fountain-head of Illumination were sent to America expressly in aid of this demoralizing plan. Doubtless the affiliated Jacobin societies in this country were instituted to propagate here the principles of the illuminated mother club in France.¹⁹

This is a formidable arraignment, but it is as yet based on surmises. Even Robinson's postscript to the American edition of his *Proofs*²⁰ could offer no precise evidence as to the existence of local French societies except for a vague statement that America contained several lodges.²¹ There was no proof positive of the existence of "Illuminated" Clubs in the country. The original Illuminati were started in 1776 in Germany, and as yet there was no direct intercourse between the two countries. But Robinson had assumed that the Bavarian Order of the Illuminati was the source of the French Societies of

¹⁹ Jedidiah Morse, A Sermon delivered . . . May 1798, etc., pp. 22-24.

Cf. p. 30. "The Declaration and Constitution of the American Society of United Irishmen, published in Philadelphia (since the publication of the first edition of this discourse), is evidently planned after the model of the Illuminated Societies in Europe, and their Test that a social body be considered secret is proof that Illuminism is spreading its undermining and disorganizing influence in this country."

²⁰ Third edition, Philadelphia, 1798.

²¹ John Robinson, *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe carried on in the Secret Meetings of Free Masons, Illuminati, and the Reading Societies*, Philadelphia, 1798. Cf. 4th edition, New York, 1798. In both of these editions Robinson appears ignorant of the fact that there was a lodge named in honor of Franklin at Auteuil, in 1778. Cf. N. Deschamps, *Les Sociétés Secrètes*, 2, 11, Paris, 1880.

Illuminées, so Morse naturally lumps together the Teutonic and Gallic organizations. The new infidelity threatening the land was manifestly not made in Germany. Nevertheless the Jacobin clubs, instituted by Genêt, were declared by Morse to be a formidable engine for the accomplishing of the designs of France to subjugate and govern this country. They started into existence by a kind of magic influence in all parts of the United States, from Georgia to New Hampshire, being linked together by correspondence, by constitutional ties, and by oaths after the manner of the Illuminati in Europe. These clubs have been the chief disseminators in this country of the demoralizing principles of the Illuminati and the circulators of those publications which are designed to bring into discredit and contempt the Christian religion. So the illuminated French Revolutionists sent over Volney "to sap the foundations of morality," and Thomas Paine to wound religion by the shafts of wit and ridicule. Paine's maxim was that "an army of principles will penetrate where an army of soldiers cannot." So a cargo of fifteen thousand copies of the *Age of Reason* was sent into the United States and disposed of by sale at a cheap rate or given away.²²

For this frightful tale of pernicious propaganda Morse still gives no authority.²³ Further gratuitous assumptions that French philosophers were in the plot may be best presented in Morse's own words: "Professor Robinson and the Abbe [*sic*] Barruel have given satisfactory proofs of a regular conspiracy against the Christian religion, of which Voltaire was at the head. . . . One method adopted by these anti-Christian con-

²² Jedidiah Morse, A Sermon preached at Charlestown, November 29, 1798, with an Appendix exhibiting proof of the early existence, progress, and deleterious effects of French intrigue and influence in the United States.

²³ The tale of the free distribution of the *Age of Reason* was given by the New York Evening Post, July 12, 1803. Cf. Moncure D. Conway, *Life of Thomas Paine*, 2,330 note, New York, 1893. Other writers have repeated this but without going back to Morse.

spirators is to publish books calculated to discredit Christianity and ascribe them to deceased authors of reputation; such is the *System of Nature*, an insidious and blasphemous work, published under the name of M. Mirabaud, secretary to the French Academy. . . . Attempts have been made to circulate those poisons in Britain. Let Americans be on their guard."²⁴

Voltaire was of course at this time a name to conjure with. As President Dwight of Yale succinctly put it, the followers of Voltaire were possessed of hatred to Christianity, contempt of the Bible, and hostility against their Maker.²⁵ But the succeeding anecdote concerning the traveller Volney, friend of Jefferson and author of the *Ruins of Empires*, makes one doubt the trustworthiness of these discourses. So Morse continues: "M. Volney, a French philosopher, when in Boston in 1797, I am credibly told, expressed himself highly gratified at the progress of the principles, political and religious, of the French Revolution. . . . 'England,' said he, 'will be revolutionized, Italy and the German States and all the enlightened parts of Europe, and then [he added, with the highest exultation] Christianity will be put in the background. Already has it received its mortal blow.' . . . The gentlemen who heard this conversation are of the first respectability. One of them added that he 'had been accustomed to hear similar sentiments from almost every Frenchman he had conversed with since the summer of 1792.' . . . If we love our holy religion and our country," concludes Morse, "let us shun the philosophy of Europe."²⁶

Lacking direct evidence as to the great conspiracy, Morse fills up his discourse with these hearsay anec-

²⁴ Jedidiah Morse, A Sermon preached at Charlestown, November 29, 1798, p. 20, note.

²⁵ Timothy Dwight, *Travels in New York and New England*, 4,367. New Haven, 1821-22.

²⁶ Jedidiah Morse, A Sermon preached at Charlestown, p. 21, note.

dotes. But in his fast-day sermon of 1799 he returns to the attack with better ammunition. The story is a long one, but highly interesting as showing how free-thinking had to contend against a virtual alliance between Church and State. In attacking Jefferson's friend, Volney, the New England pulpit had been charged with meddling in politics. But, it was replied, the clergy had a perfect right to do their part in saving the State. This will explain the tone of remonstrance which marks the opening of Morse's last and most important discourse:

"It must appear strange to a man who has impartially marked the career of abominations which the French government has pursued for several years past, that they should still find advocates among some Americans. . . . It has long been suspected that secret societies, under the influence and direction of France, holding principles subversive of our religion and government, existed somewhere in this country. This suspicion was cautiously suggested from this desk on the day of the last national fast. . . . I have now in my possession complete and indubitable proof that such societies do exist, and have for many years existed in the United States. I have, my brethren, an official, authenticated list of the names, ages, places of nativity, professions, etc., of the officers and members of a Society of Illuminati, consisting of one hundred members instituted in Virginia by the Grand Orient of France. This society has a deputy, whose name is on the list, who resides at the Mother Society in France, to communicate from thence all needful information and instruction. The date of their institution is 1786. The seal and motto of this society correspond with their detestable principles and designs. The members are chiefly emigrants from France and St. Domingo with the addition of a few Americans and some from almost all the nations of Europe. . . . There is evidence of the existence of a society of like nature and probably of more ancient date at New York, out of which have sprung fourteen others. The pernicious fruits of their insidious efforts are our unhappy political divisions, the increasing abuse of our wise and faithful rulers, the virulent opposition to some of the laws of our country, the Pennsylvania insurrection, the industrious circulation of corrupting books, and the consequent wonderful spread of infidelity, impiety, and immorality. The destruction of the clergy in all countries is evidently a part of the French system. What have the clergy of the United States done to provoke hostility?

They have 'preached politics,' being opposed to the hostile designs and insidious arts of the French government and to those atheistical, demoralizing, and detestable principles which their emissaries are endeavoring to disseminate in our country. To prevent this, it behoves us to watch the movements and detect and expose the machinations of their numerous emissaries among us. . . . I have received the following documents through the most respectable channel.²⁷ . . . The best informed Free Masons among us who have seen the preceding documents, disclaim these societies. They have presumptuously assumed the forms of Masonry, but are not of the order of true and good Masons. They are impostors. . . . There are 1,700 of these Illuminati among us all bound together by oath. Nay, there is too much reason to fear that many thousands of Frenchmen who are scattered through the United States, particularly southward of New England, are combined and organized (with other foreigners and some disaffected and unprincipled Americans) in these societies. . . . The principles and objects of this society are in part deducible from their motto and their horrid seal."²⁸

This is the last of Morse's sensational disclosures. Its reference to the free-thinking societies of New York is one thing, the alleged connection between Illuminism and Masonry another. Both these subjects we shall take up later, since the former was an Anglo-American

²⁷ Cf. A Sermon exhibiting, etc., p. 35, Copy of an Original Document (translation): "At the East of the Lodge of Portsmouth in Virginia, the 17th of the 5th month in the year of True Light 5798, the Respectable French Provincial Lodge, regularly appointed under the distinctive title of Wisdom, 2660 by the Grand Orient of France, to the very respectable French Lodge, the Union, No. 14 constituted by the Grand Orient of New York. . . . We congratulate you TT ∴ CC ∴ FF ∴ upon the new constitutions or Regulations which you have obtained from the Grand Orient of New York. . . . With these sentiments we have the favour to be P ∴ L ∴ N ∴ M ∴ Q ∴ V ∴ S ∴ C.

Your very affectionate FF ∴.

By order of the very respectable
Provincial Lodge of Wisdom.

GREU,

Secretary."

Morse adds to this translation a facsimile of what he refers to as a "horrid seal." This seal consists of such familiar symbols as the skull and crossbones, the sun and moon, and Masonic compasses. It is fortified by this Latin motto, "Amplius homines oculis quam auribus credunt."

²⁸ Jedidiah Morse, A Sermon exhibiting the Present Dangers and Consequent Duties of the Citizens of the United States of America, delivered at Charlestown, April 25, 1799, the Day of the National Fast, pp. iii, 15-46. A second printing of this sermon was made at Hartford, 1799.

rather than a Gallic affair, while the latter is a complication due to the "Anti-Masonic storm" of the next generation. Meanwhile Morse's sermons furnished a nine days' wonder. His reprinting in facsimile of the "horrid seal" with its skull and crossbones whetted the curiosity of the undergraduates who about this time were busied in their secret societies.²⁹ So we find the authorities at Harvard and Yale addressing words of warning to their charges. For example, the Reverend David Tappan, Hollis Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, delivers a discourse "occasioned by the approaching departure of the Senior class from the University."³⁰ Basing his remarks on Dr. Morse's National Fast sermon,³¹ he cautions his hearers against the pretences to refined morality, to the most generous zeal for universal liberty and happiness, which have been made both by the Illuminati and by French politicians. Let the horrid practical fruits of such pretensions in the old world engrave on your hearts a perpetual caution against these innovating theories.

But it was Timothy Dwight, the "Pope of Connecticut," who was the chief academic defender of the faith. To the candidates for the baccalaureate in Yale College he addressed two discourses on *The Nature and Danger*

²⁹ The History of Phi Beta Kappa is a curious case in point. Founded at Jefferson's Alma Mater, the College of William and Mary, in 1776, a chapter was established at Yale in 1780 and at Harvard in 1781, and at Dartmouth in 1787, upon the joint action of the two former colleges. But as early as 1779, it was petitioned that the Harvard branch be conducted "in a less mysterious manner." This refers in part to letters in cipher passing between the Alpha Chapter of Virginia and the different branches. In the latter Anti-Masonic agitation, Jefferson's name was brought in, and he was charged with having founded this society and having fostered in it pernicious principles. In 1831 Avery Allen published his treatise on Masonry, containing a Key to the Phi Beta Kappa which criticised the motto of the society as follows: "Philosophy has been the watchword of infidels in every age, and by its learned and enchanting sound many unwary youths have been led to reject the only sure guide to heaven." The same year the Harvard chapter voted that "no oath or form of secrecy shall be required of any member of the society." Cf. John M. McBride, "The Phi Beta Kappa Society," *Sewanee Review*, April, 1915.

³⁰ Boston, 1798.

³¹ Jedidiah Morse, *A Sermon preached at Charlestown*, p. 21.

of *Infidel Philosophy*.³² Since the author apologizes for these discourses as "perhaps longer than the reader would have wished," we may simply say that Dwight's statements are somewhat contradictory. Charging the French Committee of Public Instruction with the present propaganda of free thought, he concludes as follows:

"As mere infidelity, it teaches nothing but to contest all principles and to adopt none. As scepticism, it has an ocean of doubt and agitation, in which there are no soundings, and to which there is no shore. As animalism and atheism, it completes the ravage and ruin of man, which in its preceding forms it had so successfully begun. It now holds out the rank Circæan draught, and sends the deluded wretches who are allured to taste, to bristle and wallow with the swine, to play tricks with the monkey, to rage and rend with the tiger, and to putrefy into nothing with the herd of kindred brutes."³³

Dwight's work is historically of slight worth. The only thing of value in it is a postscript by the English editor impugning the credit to be given to Robinson's so-called *Proofs*.³⁴ The Scottish professor with his hearsay evidences is compared, in the language of Prior, to "the honest rook, who told a snipe, who told a steer." Nevertheless, in spite of certain doubts cast upon the *Proofs* of Robinson and his borrowings from Barruel, both these authorities were accepted as true by the general reader. A popular edition of extracts from their works was speedily published by Seth Payson under the title *Proofs of the Real Existence and Dangerous Tendency of Illuminism*.³⁵ This convenient handbook contained not only extracts from the most interesting passages of the two foreign authors, but "collateral proofs" of the statements of Morse. A Masonic friend of Payson's, for example, tells him that the Portsmouth branch is swelled by the arrival of the French fleet from St. Domingo. This lodge is not

³² September 9, 1797, 3d edition, Cambridge (England), 1804.

³³ *Infidel Philosophy*, p. 89.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

³⁵ P. 199, Charlestown [Mass.], 1802.

in fellowship with the ancient order of Masons, but one of its members is a German.³⁶

This is the most direct corroboration we have concerning Morse's statements regarding the Southern branch of Illuminism. It also furnishes a possible point of connection between America and Germany as the original home of the movement. But that connection is somewhat dubious. Robinson depends upon Barruel, but the latter's *Memoirs* were declared by a writer of the next generation as completely discredited, being written under the influence of an ardent imagination.³⁷ These strictures of a compatriot are manifestly too severe. A more moderate opinion is given by an English reviewer to the effect that however extravagant may be the opinions of some leading men among the Illuminées, the average will of the party, the collective pursuit of the confederated lodges, appears rather to have had Socinianism and Republicanism than Atheism and Anarchy for its object.³⁸

Slight attention was apparently paid to such a defence, for it availed little against the Abbé's dramatic presentation of the vast conspiracy. Act I presents the means of the conspirators: philosophizing mankind through the Encyclopædia, etc.—the extinction of Jesuits; the extinction of all the religious orders; Voltaire's colony at Clèves under Frederick the Great; academic honors; and inundations of anti-Christian writings. Act II connects the Gauls with the Germans; a deputation arrives from Weishaupt to the Free Masons of Paris; then comes the success of the Deputies, and finally the coalition of the conspiring sophisters, Masons and

³⁶ Proofs, p. 104.

³⁷ J. J. Monnier, *De l'influence attribuée aux Philosophes aux Francs-Maçons et aux illuminées sur la révolution de France*, p. ii, Paris, 1822.

³⁸ This opinion was presented in the first American edition of Barruel's *Memoirs*, Elizabeth-Town, 1799, entitled, *The Abbé Barruel—Memoirs illustrating the History of French Jacobinism* (Preface of translator, who objects to the London Monthly Review of June, 1798, p. 240).

Illuminées, generating the Jacobins.³⁹ In the Third Act, the Grand Orient of Paris is presented as a reunion of all the lodges of the Kingdom, a sort of Masonic parliament with committees of the Administration of Paris, of the Provinces and of the Degrees. This grand empire over French Masonry issued its instructions to the lodges in Savoy and Switzerland, to those of Portsmouth in Virginia, of Fort Royal in Grenada, and, in short, to lodges in all the French colonies.⁴⁰

This is evidently the original statement regarding the first American Illuminated Lodge, a statement which Robinson repeated without verification, but Morse had the luck to verify in his famous facsimiles "with their emblems of carnage and death." There is, however, another curious reference to this country which shows a use of the imagination, if nothing else. In 1797, says Barruel, a secret association was formed called *Amis des Noirs*. This appellation was adopted only the better to conceal the grand object of their conspiracy under the specious pretext of humanity. While occupying all Europe with the question they had proposed on the slavery of negroes in America, they never lost sight of that revolution which they had so long meditated.⁴¹

One ludicrous effect of the attack on the Illuminati was that the accusers themselves were given that bad name. In an anonymous charge against the Federalists as the Royal faction, New England was called the home of religious bigotry and persecution. Begotten at the College of New Jersey, this odious society was reared in Connecticut and confirmed, on its maturity, at Dartmouth and Yale. Educated in these colleges, its progeny has gone forth to spread tyranny and oppression over all the States. They have seized on the institutions and methods of education, pillaged the Episcopal churches,

³⁹ Barruel, *Memoirs*, IV, p. 209.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, Part II, pp. 212-213.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, Part II, p. 251.

secured land grants and money from State legislatures, waged war against other sects, sent missionaries to break up the peace between the settlers in Vermont and New York, anathematized the Church of Rome. Intolerance is ingrained in New Englanders. Remember the Blue Laws, many of which are yet in force.⁴²

This of course is pure fiction. The whole affair, however, furnished grist for the political mill. In a Fourth of July oration in 1798, President Dwight again attacked the order of the Illuminati as atheists and villains. Two years later charges of infidelity were brought against Jefferson in an anonymous pamphlet entitled *The Voice of Warning to Christians on the Ensuing Election of a President of the United States*. In spite of this and similar pamphlets, the Southern leader knew how to take care of himself. His letters show how he met the missionary labors of "the pious young monks of Harvard and Yale."⁴³ Despite their endeavors his pet project, the University of Virginia, received the stamp of Gallic thought. Moreover his Alma Mater, William and Mary, still retained its liberal atmosphere, while the neighboring Transylvania University in Kentucky became the headquarters for local Jacobinism, and finally not only in Lexington but in Georgetown and Paris, Kentucky, there were formed societies affiliated with the Jacobin club of Philadelphia.⁴⁴ And Ohio itself, although it was the old Connecticut Reserve, was charged with being a State

⁴² A View of the New England Illuminati who are Indefatigably Engaged in Destroying the Religion and Government of the United States under a Feigned Regard for Safety and under an Impious Abuse of True Religion, Philadelphia, 1799. Sabin attributes this pamphlet to John Cosins Ogden, author of A View of Religion in New England. Cf. an annotated edition of Joseph Sabin, A Dictionary of Books relating to America, New York, 1868 (copy at New York Public Library). J. B. McMaster, History of the United States, 2,500, quotes the above from the Aurora of September 6, 1800. Query: Was the Aurora article based on the pamphlet entitled A View of the New England Illuminati?

⁴³ Cf. my American Philosophy, Chapter VI, Virginia and Jefferson, New York, 1907.

⁴⁴ E. H. Gillet, History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1,300, 420; 2,144, Philadelphia, 1864.

where infidelity walked "in brazen front."⁴⁵ But this western extension of free-thinking societies more properly belongs to the later development in socialistic communities like that of Robert Owen, a development which was fostered by English rather than French influences. Meanwhile the "French craze" had died down, the "Terrible Republic" had been succeeded by a worse tyranny, and Napoleon, especially in his treatment of the free states like Switzerland, had disgusted the mass of Americans.⁴⁶

But a statement made in this connection, that the "rights of men" occupied public thoughts less and the price of cotton more,⁴⁷ is hardly borne out by the facts. Politics remained of paramount interest in the American mind. This is shown by the history of the second group of free-thinking societies, which began by discussing metaphysics and ended with influencing legislation. With New York City as a centre and Thomas Paine as a founder, it was Theophilanthropy that had a varied and interesting career. At first the movement was harshly attacked, but the defence grew rapidly strong. The Franco-American free-thinking societies had been marked by extravagances and the silliness of secrecy. The Anglo-American, on the contrary, bore an air of practicability and were open to the public. The author of *Common Sense* was no fool, and his followers carried on his propaganda both by well-edited journals and by frank discussions in what were ingeniously called Halls of Science. In regard to this theophilanthropical movement we may begin with a hostile account. The Deists, says a leader of Princeton, have never been able to

⁴⁵ Cf. The Correspondent, New York, 1827, for references to Ohio: 1,308 "Liberal opinions are gaining in the West"; 2,349 "An edition of 5000 copies of Paine's Age of Reason is proposed to meet the demands in Western New York and Ohio."

⁴⁶ Cf. Seth Payson's Proofs, p. 248, quoting Mallet de Paris, Destruction of the Helvetic Republic.

⁴⁷ William B. Cairns, "Development of American Literature from 1815 to 1830," Bulletin, University of Wisconsin, 1,1-88.

establish and keep up any religious worship among themselves. David Williams of London, priest of nature, abandoned his project because it led to atheism. So did Frederick II, the deistical King of Prussia. Some feeble attempts of the same kind have been made in the United States, but they are unworthy of being particularly noticed. The most interesting experiment of this kind was that made by the Theophilanthropists in France during the period of the Revolution. After some trial had been made of atheism and irreligion, a society was formed upon the pure principles of natural religion. Their creed was simple, consisting of two great articles—the existence of God, and the immortality of the soul. Their moral system also embraced two great principles—the love of God, and the love of man—principles which were indicated by the name “Theophilanthropists.” Their festivals were in honor of the following persons: Socrates, St. Vincent de Paul, J. J. Rousseau, and Washington—a strange conjunction of names truly.⁴⁸

The correction of such an account as this may be found in the words of Thomas Paine, who declares that the precise history of the Theophilanthropists is that they do not call themselves disciples of such and such a man. They avail themselves of the wise precepts that have been transmitted by writers of all countries and in all ages.⁴⁹ Now in attempting to form in New York a society for religious inquiry and also a society of Theophilanthropy, Paine’s most sympathetic biographer claimed that the movement was too cosmopolitan to be contained in any local organization.⁵⁰ This was in a measure true, but the whole story is to be found in con-

⁴⁸ Archibald Alexander, *Evidences of the Christian Religion*, p. 28, Philadelphia, 1836. The above account is based on M. Grégoire, *Histoire de la Theophilanthropie*; see *Quarterly Review* for January, 1823.

⁴⁹ M. D. Conway, *Writings of Thomas Paine*, 4,234, New York, 1894-96.

⁵⁰ M. D. Conway, *Life of Thomas Paine*, 2,426.

nection with one of Paine's picturesque followers, Elihu Palmer, in whose magazine, *The New York Theophilanthropist*, some of the master's posthumous papers saw the light.⁵¹ Palmer was the author of *The Principles of Nature*,⁵² a rare volume reprinted by Richard Carlisle, the London publisher who had been imprisoned for the issuance of Thomas Paine's works. It contains a very lively account of the author by his friend, Colonel John Fellows, who with Paine was a charter-member of the first free-thinking society of New York. Palmer, who was born in Connecticut and graduated from Dartmouth, being early reprov'd for the liberality of his sentiments, abandoned Calvinism for Universalism. As his biographer puts it: The childish and impious presumption of supposing the Deity capable of requiring the murder of Jesus Christ, and of calling his son to atone for the trifling *faux pas* of a woman, committed some thousand years before, was too revolting for his honest and manly mind long to brook; and, having obtained the assent of a part of the elders of his congregation to that effect, he advertised in a public paper, the *Aurora*, that on the succeeding Sunday he would deliver a discourse against the divinity of Jesus Christ.⁵³ This act of imprudence, it is added, drove Palmer even from the society whose main tenet was then hardly tolerated in the country. Turning to law, Palmer was obliged to abandon the undertaking because he had been left blind by an attack of yellow fever. But as the frontispiece of the *Principles* has it: "Though darkness drear obscured his visual ray, his mind unclouded felt no loss of day"—and he enlisted in "reason's cause." As a free-lance lecturer, Palmer now met with some success

⁵¹ M. D. Conway, *Writings of Thomas Paine*, 4, 236, note.

⁵² Or *A Development of the Moral Causes of Happiness and Misery Among the Human Species*, 1804; London, 1823.

⁵³ *Posthumous Pieces, Elihu Palmer. . . . To Which are prefixed a Memoir of Mr. Palmer by his Friend Mr. John Fellows of New York*, p. 6; London, 1826.

in Augusta, Georgia, delivering discourses upon the broad basis of deism. Returning to New York in 1796, it was immediately proposed to him to deliver lectures. Thereupon a small society was formed in aid of his exertions; which assumed, without disguise, the name of The Deistical Society. This appellation was advocated by Mr. Palmer, although some others were in favor of that of The Theophilanthropist, as being less frightful to fanatics, not many of whom would understand the term. Although his lectures were generally pretty numerously attended, there were not many who were disposed to contribute for the support of the principles, and those for the most part were limited in means. It became necessary therefore for him to make occasional excursions to other populous towns to recruit his funds, which he frequently did, to Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Newburgh on the North River.⁵⁴

The *Principles of the Deistical Society of the State of New York* consists of the commonplaces of eighteenth-century deism—that the universe proclaims the existence of one supreme Deity, that the religion of nature is the only universal religion, that science and truth are the great objects for human energy. The animus of the document lies in its final admonition that every member admitted into this association shall deem it his duty, by every suitable method in his power, to promote the cause of nature and moral truth, in opposition to all schemes of superstition and fanaticism claiming divine origin.⁵⁵ This admonition explains not only the later programme of the free-thinkers of New York, but the previous statements of Palmer concerning the earlier speculative movements. Such was his excellent defence of Illuminism when he said the Illuminati in Europe have been represented as a vicious combination of persons whose object was the destruction of all the governments

⁵⁴ Fellows, Memoir, p. 7.

⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 10, 11.

and religions of the world. If the enemies of philosophy, in that part of the globe, mean by governments the corrupt monarchies of the earth, and by religion, popular superstition, founded upon the idea of a supposed mysterious intercourse between beings of the earth and celestial powers, then they are right in this respect; for these are the governments and religions against which reason and philosophy ought to direct their energies; but if by government they mean a system of genuine republicanism, founded upon the equal rights of man, and by religion the idea of simple theism and the immortality of moral virtue, then their assertions are false, and their productions a calumny against reason and the rights of human nature.⁵⁶

Promulgated in the same year as President Monroe's doctrine against entangling political alliances, this was a kindred philosophical doctrine, in which nature was to be considered as free from the encroachment of outside agencies. In a word, this was nothing but logically developed deism, a scheme which implies that the laws governing the world are immutable and that the violations of these laws, or miraculous interference in the movements of nature, must be necessarily excluded from the grand system of universal existence.⁵⁷ Here Palmer uses the very language of Paine,⁵⁸ while in defending naturalism as against supernaturalism he clearly sees the opposition it will meet. It is this philosophy, he exclaims, that has developed the laws of the physical world and exhibited the principles on which its systematic order depends; it is this philosophy that has unfolded the moral energies of human nature, which has become an object of calumny in the estimation of a cruel and persecuting superstition.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ *Principles of Nature*, p. 114.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 198.

⁵⁸ Cf. Woodbridge Riley, *American Thought From Puritanism to Pragmatism*, p. 55, New York, 1915.

⁵⁹ Palmer, *Principles*, p. 113.

Among the advocates of this naturalism Palmer numbers not only the familiar Gallic thinkers from Condorcet to Volney, but Godwin, author of *Political Justice*, and Joel Barlow, the translator of Volney's *Ruins*. Barlow, as a diplomat in foreign parts, had no connection with the Theophilanthropists at home, but he was in thorough sympathy with their principles. Consequently he defended the memory of Thomas Paine, and in his *Advice to the Privileged Orders* presents his view of the established church as "darkening the consciousness of men in order to oppress them." He, nevertheless, takes pains to add that in the United States of America, there is, strictly speaking, no such thing as a church, and yet in no country are the people more religious. All sorts of religious opinions are entertained there, and yet no heresy among them all. All modes of worship are practised, and yet there are no schisms. Men frequently change their creed and their worship, and yet there is no apostasy. They have ministers of religion, but no priests. In short, religion is there a personal and not a corporate concern.⁶⁰

Barlow's contention is borne out by a letter of John Adams to Jefferson in which he speaks of having once addressed an army of fine young fellows from Anabaptists to Atheists, from Moravians to Socinians. This referred to Adams' Philadelphia speech of 1798.⁶¹ Now Palmer in his attacks on the "American priesthood" was both beside the mark and also somewhat inconsistent. Five years before Adams and in Philadelphia itself, he had delivered an oration at Federal Point, which contains strictures upon the union of Church and State abroad, but expressly excepts such a condition of affairs at home. As a sample of Fourth of July oratory upon the subject of illuminism and free thought, Palmer's speech is in-

⁶⁰ C. B. Todd, *Life and Letters of Joel Barlow*, pp. 89-90, New York, 1886.

⁶¹ *Works*, ed. C. F. Adams, 10,45, Boston, 1846.

structive. The age of reason and philosophy, he declares, has at length arrived and begins to illuminate the world. While the age of darkness, which spread itself over all nations, was faithfully preserved by the pious alliance of Church and State and humanity wept for the miseries of man, kingcraft and priestcraft, those mighty enemies to liberty and reason, were struck to death by the genius of 1776. Beware, ye American aristocrats! Your principles and efforts are leading you to a precipice. Civil and religious oppression will not gain much ground in the American world. If the cause of France should succeed, then farewell kings, aristocrats, and the long catalogue of clerical impositions. In justice, however, to the American clergy, it ought to be observed that in effecting our Revolution, many of them by their precepts and example afford great service.⁶²

Nevertheless there was a certain justification in the continuance of such attacks as were made by Palmer in radical journals like the *Temple of Reason* and in his own *Prospect or View of the Moral World for the Year 1804*. The latter work had for its frontispiece a symbolic picture of the *Age of Reason* and the *Rights of Man* garnished with a liberty cap. This symbol was psychological. It represented the smouldering resentment of the Columbian Illuminati against certain religious restrictions which had been but recently abolished. Prior to the Constitutional Convention of 1787, as McMaster says, the political rights of man were fenced about with restrictions which would now be thought unbearable. To be enfranchised in South Carolina, the free white man must believe in the existence of a God, in a future state of reward and punishment, and have a

⁶² Political Miscellany, passim, New York, 1793. In a note to p. 24, Palmer quotes from Morse, the Geographer, this curious passage: "The clergy in Connecticut have hitherto preserved a kind of aristocratical balance in the very democratical government of the State, which has happily operated as a check upon the overbearing spirit of Republicanism."

freehold of one hundred and fifty acres of land. No atheists, no free thinkers, no Jews, no Roman Catholics, no man, in short, who was not a believer in some form of the Protestant faith, could ever be a governor of New Jersey, New Hampshire, Connecticut, or Vermont. Any rich Christian might be the executive of Massachusetts or Maryland. Elsewhere he must be a Trinitarian and a believer in the inspiration of the Scriptures, or a Protestant and a believer in the divine authority of the Bible, or acknowledge one God, believe in heaven and in hell, and be ready to declare openly that every word in the Testament, both Old and New, was divinely inspired.⁶³

While these political restrictions may have been removed, certain social prejudices still hung on. Thus Cooper's novel *Precaution* emphasizes as the chief requirement in the choice of a husband, his piety, and warns the heroine against admiring a deist however handsome he may be.⁶⁴ And Harriet Martineau, in her *Society in America* speaks of the opprobrium directed upon such as those who embrace natural religion.⁶⁵ To the free thinker, then, the spirit which engendered such narrowness must be crushed. It therefore became the express aim of the New York Society in their organ, *The Theophilanthropist*,⁶⁶ to redeem mankind from the degrading fetters of hereditary superstition. The first charge was upon Calvin's *Institutes* "replete with its horrid doctrines and revolting views of the divine mind." How absurd, it is said, that such a system, whose never-ending and excruciating tortures are pronounced the doom of the wicked, should be called a consolatory system! Contrast now the Calvinist and the Theophilanthropist, the rigid sectarian and the lover of God and man, who believes in one supreme

⁶³ J. B. McMaster, *History of the People of the United States*, 3, 147-148, New York, 1886-1913.

⁶⁴ T. R. Lounsbury, *J. F. Cooper*, pp. 25-26, Boston, 1893.

⁶⁵ *Society in America*, 2, 316, New York, 1837.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-5.

and incomprehensible Deity, the Creator and Conservator of the universe; who has for his duties benevolence and justice, and for his religion, the religion of nature, upon whose every leaf his creeds and duties are imprinted.⁶⁷

All this is but an echo of Paine's *Discourse at the Society of the Theophilanthropists*, which declares that the existence of a God is the first dogma of the Theophilanthropist, and the universe his Bible. It is there that he reads of God; it is there that the proofs of His existence are to be sought and to be found.⁶⁸ As an organ the New York *Theophilanthropist* was not much of a success.⁶⁹ Its readers could not make out what it was all about. Articles defending the character of Thomas Paine were pertinent, but those explaining the morality of Mohammedanism were not. So there was room for a better presentation of free thought. This was fulfilled by *The Correspondent*, edited by the English radical, George Houston, who came over with the halo of persecution, having been imprisoned in Newgate for his translations of d'Holbach's *Ecce Homo*.⁷⁰ *The Correspondent* announces itself as "A Strict Enquiry into the Origin of Religion." Its prospectus claims that there is place for a paper which will fearlessly advocate the paramount importance of the laws of nature and the dignity of reason. As one subscriber immediately submits, while every denomination, every sect, and almost every distinct church have their presses, this advantage

⁶⁷ The *Theophilanthropist*, containing Critical, Moral, Theological, and Literary Essays . . . by a Society, New York, 1810.

⁶⁸ Thomas Paine, *Discourse at The Society of the Theophilanthropists*, p. 27, Paris (1797).

⁶⁹ Another ephemeral journal was *The Temple of Reason*, published by D. Driscoll, 1800-02, with articles by Paine and Palmer.

⁷⁰ Cf. John M. Robertson, *A Short History of Free Thought*, 2,385, where *The Correspondent* is wrongly given as *The Correspondence*. Robertson also implies that *The Minerva* was an organ of free thought, whereas it announces itself as "A Literary, Entertaining, and Scientific Journal," edited by George Houston, New York, 1824-25.

has hitherto been denied to the deists.⁷¹ This is corroborated by the journal's first press notices. *The National Advocate* says that this is probably the first periodical work ever published in the United States that publicly avows and defends deism. The New York *Times* speaks of the new weekly paper as one in which the Bible is attacked, the Christian system blasphemed, and deism defended—Thomas Paine being the hero and reason the idol. Finally, the Albany *Advocate* proposes to carry on a constant and rigid warfare with *The Correspondent*, and like its esteemed contemporary would consign the liberal organ to the flames. But neither was the latter to be suppressed nor its by-product, the Philosophical Library. As the organ of the Free Press Association the journal starts reporting the Secretary's lectures on "The Inconsistencies, Absurdities, and Contradictions of the Bible," and ends with debates on such a question as "whether a revelation by a supreme being has ever been made to man."⁷² Moreover its liberal library began with the publication of the *Ecce Homo* and followed with the theological writings of Paine, Palmer, Hume, Gibbon, and Volney. That both the propaganda and the publications had a wide spread is attested by a letter from a Philadelphia correspondent. Called an infidel and heretic, he read Volney's *Ruins*; having found a copy of Paine, which the owner kept locked up, he bought it. Lending these volumes to his neighbors, they formed a club and soon possessed themselves of the *Ecce Homo*, of Palmer's *Principles*, and of such works as *Christianity Unveiled* and *The Spiritual Mustard Pot*.⁷³

The Correspondent now becomes a veritable seed-bed for radical clubs. An account of these and their doings form an unwritten but significant chapter in American thought. According to the current numbers of this

⁷¹ The Correspondent, 1,3, 1827-29.

⁷² Ibid., 2,85; 5,13.

⁷³ Ibid., 3,219.

journal, there were these activities in the following States: in Delaware, the Wilmington Society investigates the truth or falsehood of the Bible; in Maryland, the Baltimore Association of Liberals stands for a free press, free library, and free discussion; in New Jersey, the Paterson Free Reading Society protests against our libraries containing so few scientific and philosophical works of established character, works consigned to the flames by fanaticism; in Ohio, the Cincinnati Society for Mutual Instruction in Natural Science languished at first, but was later stimulated by the establishment of the *Western Tiller*; in Pennsylvania is found a Philadelphia Society of Liberal Friends, and a Philosophical Society to discuss Paine's *Age of Reason* and Volney's *Ruins*; in Vermont, the Woodstock Free Reading Society annually celebrates Paine's birthday; in New Hampshire, the Dover Free Press Association holds a similar celebration and signals it with a song written for the occasion, which ends as follows:

“What sovereignty is, and from whence its true birth,
 Oh, PAINE! 'twas *thy* pen that defin'd,
 And show'd that no right is divine on this earth
 But the glorious 'Rights of Mankind.'
 When dark Superstition and Prejudice cease
 To trammel the mind with their chain,
 Amid an elysium of joy and of peace,
 Blest man shall be grateful to PAINE.” ⁷⁴

Such are the provincial efforts and effusions. The metropolis does more. As successors and heirs to the old Deistical Society, the New York Theophilanthropistical Society widely extends its activities. According to its official organ, between 1827 and 1829, it spreads not only over the city but over the State. Declaring its religion to be the religion of nature, it begins with a Paine celebration, defends the free-thinking of Franklin and Jeffer-

⁷⁴ The Correspondent, 3,45.

son, organizes a debating society on the Bowery, and in the upper part of the city inaugurates a society of free inquirers whose object is to paralyze the efforts of bigotry. Under the same auspices and outside of the metropolis, Albany holds a Paine celebration, Lockport starts a journal called *Priestcraft Exposed*, and Rochester one called *Plain Truth*. Naturally all this stirs up a series of attacks. One sample will serve for the rest. As to the Utica auxiliary of the infidel society in New York, says the *Western Recorder*, every decent man and every good citizen will look upon its doings as a public outrage; every man who belongs to it should be distinctly marked as a foe to his country, an enemy both to God and man.⁷⁵

While the Free Press Association never achieved the formation of a proposed General Association of Liberals to spread its principles under one name, it managed to spread those opinions among sympathizers. These were found largely among the first group of socialists formed in the country under the leadership of the English radical philanthropist Robert Owen, the founder of the famous New Harmony community. But before we take up the cause of liberal principles in Ohio and its vicinity, a word is needful as to the winding up of *The Correspondent*. That organ of Theophilanthropy—as it inadvertently acknowledges in its last number—had been too exclusively devoted to theological discussions. But this was not the only reason for its demise. The tone of this journal, it must be confessed, was often cheap. Houston, in the words of an admirer, might have erected “the first Light House for Reason in the East,” as Owen did in the West, but its beams did not penetrate polite society. He offended respectability when, for one thing, he attacked the strict observance of the Sabbath as unconstitutional, and in general was on a par with one of his

⁷⁵ *The Correspondent*, 4, 173.

exchanges, *The Herald of Heresy*.⁷⁶ But it was from mixing in politics that he met with the most violent objections. To ridicule and agitate against Sabbath stage-coaches was one thing; to deride the laws of blasphemy enacted in New Hampshire was another. While the rural legislators, to punish any "curse or reproach" upon the canonical Scriptures, might seemingly contravene the Federal constitutional rights on freedom of religious belief, still the whole complicated question was one of States' rights. So in 1829, *The Correspondent* went out of business with a last despairing wail regarding the secret propaganda which aimed to injure the printing establishment of George Houston.

Evidently this journal had done its work, for a more exciting political campaign for liberal rights had meanwhile arisen in the East, while in the West another "high priest of atheism and deism" had arisen in the person of Robert Owen. The New Harmony settlement in Ohio, like the Free Enquiry Society in New York, was immediately counted "an odium in polite society." In Pittsburgh, as one of Houston's correspondents recounted, no one would acknowledge to have any dealing with a settlement which contained no church and no Bible society.⁷⁷ And Owen himself, to judge from the language he used in writing to the *Western Monthly Review*, did not mince matters in addressing "the deluded pious and the bigot."⁷⁸ Moreover in regard to his recent debate at Cincinnati with Alexander Campbell on the general subject "whether mankind can be trained to become more happy with or without religion," Owen took the privative side against the superstitionists. He added that he had been dexterously misrepresented, by a "Kentucky manœuvre."⁷⁹

⁷⁶ The Correspondent, 1,84; 2,78; 3,241.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 3,155.

⁷⁸ Life of Robert Owen by Himself, 1,152, London, 1857.

⁷⁹ The Correspondent, 5,285.

Robert Owen came to the country with two main tenets, one negative and one positive. The former was the familiar attack on priestcraft. He explains that he had been early satisfied that all religions had emanated from the same source and their varieties from the same false images of our early ancestors, in short, that all the religions of the world are so many geographical insanities.⁸⁰ But the negative must be supplanted by the positive. So in place of an inscrutable supernaturalism Owen put a calculable naturalism. All my qualities, he argued, were forced on me by nature, and my language, religion, and habits by society; nature gave the qualities and society directed them.⁸¹

We might call all this a violent leap from Puritanism to positivism. In other words, instead of Deity fore-ordaining, heredity and environment were to ordain. At any rate the new determinism must have astonished the natives; but Owen, like the "reasoning machine" which Coleridge called him, was still relentless in his logic. "Had you," he would say, "on my right hand, been brought up under the influence of such circumstances as are to be found at the foot of the Rocky Mountains, you would all have been Indians, save as to the color of your skins. Had you, on my left hand, been exposed from infancy to the circumstances which prevail in China, you would have been Chinese, except in form and figure."⁸²

Such were the working plans for Owen's Preliminary Society of New Harmony, where there should be no churches, no creeds, no religious worship, but in their stead moral lectures and such a system of public education as would foster in the young a love of justice, moral-

⁸⁰ Frank Podmore, *Robert Owen, A Biography*, 1,9, New York, 1907. Cf. *Debate between Robert Owen and the Rev. J. H. Roehnek*, p. 7, London, 1837.

⁸¹ Podmore, *ibid.*, 1,20.

⁸² J. B. McMaster, *The Acquisition of the Political, Social, and Industrial Rights of Man in America*, p. 91, Cleveland, 1903.

ity, and truth—an education which for the very young included dancing, singing, and military drill, and for the older in years, studies ranging from agriculture and botany to history and music.⁸³

The effect of such outright naturalism was seen in the case of Owen's son, who declared: "I have no religion. . . . I have not accustomed myself to personifying a first cause; I embody no superhuman spirits, angelic or infernal."⁸⁴ These assertions were made in the Hall of Science, New York, and to a sympathetic circle of free inquirers. When similar sentiments were brought before the general public in the form of a challenge to the clergy of the United States, they elicited an unwarranted stir. In the notorious debate with the Reverend Alexander Campbell, who took up the challenge to meet Owen in a friendly discussion, the socialist brought forth five propositions which he was ready to defend. Assuming that all religions are founded on ignorance, he inferred that they are the only real bar to the formation of a society of virtue, of intelligence, of charity (in the most extended sense).⁸⁵ The eight days of debate, which drew as many thousands of hearers, ended as such debates usually do. Mrs. Trollope, who was present, observed that neither the cleric nor the socialist appeared to answer the other, but to confine themselves to the utterances of what they had uppermost in their minds. When the discussion began, the one became too elaborately theological, and the other benighted in the mists of his own theories.⁸⁶

Owen explained that the object of the Cincinnati debate was not to discuss the truths or falsehood of the

⁸³ Cf. McMaster, *The Acquisition of the Political, Social, and Industrial Rights of Man in America*, p. 93.

⁸⁴ R. D. Owen, *An Address on the Influence of the Clerical Profession*, p. 9, London, 1840.

⁸⁵ *Debate on the Evidences of Christianity, etc., between Robert Owen and Alexander Campbell*, p. 30, London, 1839.

⁸⁶ Mrs. Trollope, *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, 2, 207, London, 1832.

Christian religion, but to ascertain the errors in all religions which prevent them from being efficacious in practice, and to bring out all that is really valuable in each, leaving out their errors, and thus to form from them collectively a religion wholly true and consistent, that it may become universal and be acted upon consistently by all.⁸⁷ We are not concerned with Owen's projected eclecticism, which harked back to the Jefferson Bible, and in a measure anticipated Comte's *Religion of Humanity*. The ferment of free thought is our concern, but here unfortunately Owen checked an embryonic naturalism by his overheated statements. His kindest biographer acknowledges that he looked upon religion as a kind of insanity;⁸⁸ and his *Book of the New Moral World* bears this out. In this world, averred the radical, the priesthood must be abolished and all works of theology destroyed.⁸⁹ Referring to Christian believers in a Christian country as "inmates in a lunatic asylum,"⁹⁰ Owen did anything but help his valuable social reformers. But his Declaration of Mental Independence capped the climax of his unpopularity among the conservatives. To the mind of the radical, society suffered under a trinity of evils—private property, orthodox religion, and the "marriages of the priesthood of the old immoral world."⁹¹ Owen promulgated these doctrines on what was then the frontier, and at a time when manners were more or less free and easy.⁹² But Indiana was not yet Dakota, and the doctrine of divorce for incompatibility of temper had not yet reached the courts. As a local sheet interpreted it, Mr. Owen's "fine theories" allowed persons to dissolve the matrimonial contract at pleasure.⁹³ And

⁸⁷ Podmore, Robert Owen, A Biography, 1,343. ⁸⁸ Ibid., 2,498.

⁸⁹ Robert Owen, Book of the New Moral World, Part III, p. 56.

⁹⁰ Debate with Campbell, p. 25.

⁹¹ Cf. pamphlet with this title, Leeds, 1840.

⁹² Cf. William Owen, Diary, 1824–25, Indianapolis, 1900.

⁹³ Knoxville, Tenn., Enquirer, May 16, 1827.

worse was to follow when the reformer's son and namesake subsequently issued his *Moral Physiology, or A Brief and Plain Treatise on the Population Question*. The treatise was not brief but plain, very plain, and one can imagine the air of astonished horror with which directions on birth control were received among the genteel classes, especially in the East where the traditions of prisms and prunes still obtained. A journal like *The March of Mind* might declare that Robert Owen's simple declaration of mental independence unshackled the minds of hundreds from the thralldom of superstition; but when his two sons and the "female republican," Frances Wright, removed to New York, they got into hot water. Miss Wright, said Robert Dale Owen, had radical views touching the independence of women, whether married or single.⁹⁴ To this must be added her views on abolition as shown in her attempts to overcome the prejudices against negroes in her community at Nashoba, Tennessee. Finally, there were her pronounced opinions in favor of the dignity of labor, which came out when she and the two younger Owens formed the left wing of the Free Enquirers of New York. The older group of Enquirers, as *The Correspondent* put it, had taken a set against clerical impostors—"the Eastern Magi, with their black cockade." These efforts were largely literary, but now with the advent of the Western reformers, theory was succeeded by practice and the free-thinkers entered the political arena.

The year of the last number of *The Correspondent* was the year of the first year of *The Workingman's Advocate*, which declared in its prospectus that there was something "radically wrong" in the "existing state of society."⁹⁵ In these social reforms we take interest only in so

⁹⁴ Threading My Way, p. 302, London, 1874.

⁹⁵ No. 1, October, 1829, quoted by J. B. McMaster, *The Acquisition of the Political, Social, and Industrial Rights of Man in America*, p. 101.

far as they were connected with mental independence. Thus the *Advocate* protested against such exclusive privileges as one part of the community having the means of education in college, while another was restricted to the common schools. Along with the *Advocate* there now sprang up a new crop of liberal journals; such were the New York *Telescope*, which scrutinized the encroachments of the clergy; the Rochester *Spirit of the Age*, which advocated an open Sunday; the Charleston *Free Press*, which announced "no sect, no creed, open to all." These journals were in general free-thinking, but their particular aim was political. We may only note that, because of this connection, the Workingmen's party had hard sledding in New York. Theirs was called the Fanny Wright ticket, the infidel ticket.

But the fight became even more complicated when the movement for social reform became involved with that peculiar movement, the Anti-Masonic agitation. This we are concerned with only as it serves to summarize the whole business of our early free-thinking societies. New York State politics from 1826-30 was stirred up by what was called the "Western excitement." This referred to the real abduction and alleged murder of one William Morgan at Fort Niagara. According to the report submitted to the State Senate, Morgan was an obscure representative among the thirty thousand Masons of the commonwealth. Attempting to publish a book exposing the secrets of his order, he was spirited away by the "new order of Jesuits"—the society of Free and Accepted Masons.⁹⁶ According to the report of the Anti-Masonic convention, the committee of inquiry appointed by that body found, among other things, that the expositions of Masonic secrets were true, that Freemasonry originated early in the eighteenth century, and

⁹⁶ James C. Odierno, *Opinions on Speculative Masonry, Relative to its Origin, Nature and Tendency*, pp. 190-198, Boston, 1830.

that its principles were inconsistent with the genius of American institutions.⁹⁷ This report, although ridiculed by the Masonic organization itself, was substantiated by what one of the oppositors called "a host of new, learned, and scrutinizing enemies."⁹⁸ Their testimony was given in a set of *Opinions on Speculative Masonry, Relative to its Origin, Nature, and Tendency*. These opinions, offered by the colleges, the bench, and the cloth, disclosed that history was repeating itself; that that which had happened in France was happening here. In a word, this meant that the old Masonry had been penetrated by Illuminism; that the original English convivial society of Free and Accepted Masons had been perverted by the intrusion of fanciful Gallic novelties. As to its origin, the critics concluded that the ancient order was not ancient. As Professor Leonard Woods remarked respecting the alleged high antiquity of Freemasonry, "If they assert that it existed in Solomon's day, they might as well assert that Solomon made a balloon and frequently rode in it from Jerusalem to Tyre."⁹⁹ The venerable age of the institution is further rendered ridiculous by the fact that the Grand Lodge of England was instituted in 1717, and the first American lodge in 1733.¹⁰⁰

So much for the origin of the movement. As for its nature, similar unfavorable opinions were held. Though Washington joined the early Anglo-American branch, he came to suspect the Gallic varieties of the order. Remembering the machinations of Genêt and the activities of the candidates of the Jacobin societies in the land, the President's Farewell Address contained a grave warning against secret societies.¹⁰¹ To its opponents then Free-

⁹⁷ Augustus Row, *Masonic Biography and Dictionary*, pp. 278-279, Philadelphia, 1868.

⁹⁸ Odierne, p. 250.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

¹⁰⁰ L. F. Fosdick, *The French Blood in America*, pp. 388-391, New York, 1911.

¹⁰¹ Odierne, p. 52.

masonry is fictitious in its origin and dubious in its nature. It is also pernicious in its tendency. Here the bill of attainder has many counts. It is anti-Christian because it appeals to Jew and pagan; it is blasphemous because it attempts a personification of the Great Jehovah; it is illegal because it swears to protect a companion "whether right or wrong"; it is seditious because the candidate for the third degree swears to keep the brothers' secrets . . . "murder and treason only excepted, and those at my own discretion."¹⁰²

Such were the charges brought by a host of seceders from the order. The old religious denunciations of the secret societies were now reinforced by political denunciations, and serve to explain the bitterness of the attacks on the part of the legal talent of the country. Thus the evil influence of Masonry, civil, social, and political, was portrayed by Charles Sumner in an address to the Suffolk Committee, while John Quincy Adams devoted a whole volume of letters tracing the institution of Masonry from its introduction into the Protestant colonies of North America to the admissions of the Rhode Island Legislative Committee.¹⁰³

But we will not meddle with politics except to note that because Masonry sought to influence "the bench of justice" it met with added opposition from "the sacred desk." The cloth now used an old weapon to meet the new menace. This is their syllogism: Free Masonry is connected with Illuminism; but Illuminism is infidel; therefore, "Masonry leads directly to infidelity." Such is the reasoning implied in Thacher's letters to a brother in the church. Now how can it be proved that Masonry and Illuminism are mutually coupled together? Thacher avails himself of the threadbare arguments of Robinson's *Proofs*. He also has some new evidence. A Massachu-

¹⁰² Odierno, *passim*.

¹⁰³ Cf. *Letters on the Masonic Institution*, Boston, 1847.

setts friend informs him that he had heard indirectly through Dr. Timothy Dwight that the lodge of Portsmouth was "Illuminated"; and directly from a member of that lodge that it was affiliated with French Jacobinism. The writer also knew a young man who had become a gross infidel from joining a French society in one of the Middle States, this society teaching that "the Christian religion was all an imposition, and would soon be abolished."¹⁰⁴

From such information, Thacher is satisfied of the validity of the original proposition, that the tendency of Freemasonry is to infidelity, since it was exactly fitted for an engine of infidel philosophy, particularly as new-modelled and ornamented by the French. Finally, says the author, we cannot suppose that so large and fair a portion of the earth as America should be entirely free from the machinations of the Grand Orient of Paris. "There are certainly very many leading Masons of high standing in this country who are deists; and I have personally known several who were not ashamed to avow their atheism."¹⁰⁵

All this was written in 1829, the year in which the *New York Correspondent* ceased and the *New Harmony Gazette*, changed to the *Free Enquirer*, was turned into a political organ. We may therefore take the third decade of the century as marking the beginning of the end of free-thinking societies in America. Originally attacked because of their so-called atheistic tendencies, their secrecy was their final undoing. Their possible value as vehicles of rationalism had disappeared in foolish mummery. So from this time on, those who had liberal leanings joined organizations like Brook Farm and followed masters like the sweetly reasonable Emerson. Moreover, for those who preferred the Gallic type of

¹⁰⁴ Letter of June 29, 1829, by Ethan Smith, *Dissertation on the Prophecies*, second edition, p. 176.

¹⁰⁵ Odierno, p. 50.

rationalism, the philosophy of Victor Cousin offered a welcome addition to their intellectual diet.¹⁰⁶ But it should be noticed that those who took up the New England Transcendentalism and the French Eclecticism were largely college-bred; for the masses, with a mere common-school education, there was no outlet for superabundant mental activity. Some took up with revivalism, as an emotional substitute for thought; but the radicals were left in the lurch. There were no more "Tom" Paines left and no "Bob" Ingersolls had as yet appeared on the horizon. Moreover, a civil war was to come and go before Herbert Spencer's agnosticism spread through the land. It was for such reasons then that Robert Owen's "Incomprehensible Power" gained no worshippers and that his "Rational Religion" fell flat. So, as Owen's son summarized the matter in the Forties, "While the Presidents of the United States were admittedly heterodox at the founding of the republic,¹⁰⁷ now politicians are circumspect, and the orthodox clergy, lamenting the dangers of infidelity, are afraid to discuss both sides of the question; . . . they choose that heresy shall be put down without an argument, and are responsible for their insane revivals. Self-styled servants of God, they extend their society from the shores of the Atlantic to the Indian wigwams on the Missouri."

¹⁰⁶ See my article "La philosophie française en Amérique" in the *Revue Philosophique*, November, 1917.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. R. D. Owen, Address on Free Enquiry [and] Aphorisms by Thomas Jefferson, pp. 10-12, London, [n. d.].

THE PILGRIM TERCENTENARY AND THEOLOGICAL PROGRESS

JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

The approaching tercentenary of the founding of Plymouth incites, not to say compels, a review of the remarkable developments and departures from the doctrines of the fathers that have taken place in these three hundred years and calls for a conscientious consideration of what these changes ought to lead to in theological and ecclesiastical readjustments. It is a task which overawes as well as invites and one in which there is need of wide coöperation.

I

The chief concern of the founders of New England was not with doctrine but with church government. It was not to secure either freedom, except for their own uses, or tolerance as a principle, that they dared the perils and hardships of the deep and of the wilderness. Their aim, pursued with invincible singleness of mind, was to establish what they believed to be the only true and scriptural form of government of church and state — a coöperative theocracy. It is correct to call their commonwealth democratic only in the sense that it contained the seeds and sure previsions of democracy. That it was a great step forward in religious and social construction is universally conceded.

With the "Congregational Way," as these ecclesiastical pioneers later termed it, was closely linked a body of doctrine far more in accord with their conservative than

with their progressive principles. It was in brief that set forth by the Westminster Assembly, in whose doctrinal statements they shared fully with their brethren in England. This theology held sway over New England, though not without considerable individual dissent and with gradually loosening hold, until well into the nineteenth century and finally "collapsed" through pressure both from without and from within.

Few chapters in the history of religious thought are fuller of intensity and pathos than that of the supreme effort of Calvinism to maintain itself in this New World against the forces of religious and political progress and the increasing demand for a freer and larger faith. Calvinism found itself unable to meet the disintegrating and demoralizing influences incident to the heavy task of building up a civilization in a new and none too hospitable soil. It sufficed for elect souls initiating a new venture of faith, but it proved too barren and exacting for the wear and tear of every-day prolonged pioneering. Inevitably the severities and inconsistencies of the Westminster standards suffered modification and reduction. "Arminianism," which stood for looseness of all sorts, doctrinal, spiritual, moral, crept into New England in the eighteenth century — an admixture of rational protest against Calvinistic determinism and the other manifest extremes of doctrine and practice, and of sordid relapse into a lower stratum of faith and life. Against this incoming tide of "infidelity," threatening, so they believed, the very foundations of religion, Jonathan Edwards, Samuel Hopkins, and their comrades and successors of the "New Lights" set themselves with consuming zeal, and by sheer spiritual might turned back the tide, not only rescuing Calvinism but advancing its standard to new heights of shining victory. But they were heights impossible to maintain and "High Calvinism" soon had to ally itself with "Moderate Calvinism"

in order to resist the growing incursions of more progressive thought which had been gathering during and succeeding the Revolution and which were at length succeeded by the Unitarian movement.

II

It has been customary to regard Unitarianism as the natural development and culmination of liberal tendencies at work within the New England churches almost from the beginning, and many attempts have been made to spread the Unitarian mantle and even to attach the Unitarian name to all the more liberal New England preachers and theologians who protested against the narrower views prevalent in their time. Perhaps the best presentation of this claim is that of George Willis Cooke in his *Unitarianism in America*. The claim is an exceedingly questionable one, though it has helped to demonstrate how many of these protesters there were, and how reasonable and vigorous were their departures from Westminster theology. If we subject these protests, as recounted by Mr. Cooke, to examination, we find that they were along the following lines: (1) Declarations in favor of liberty of individual thought and judgment, such as that made by Samuel Willard, pastor of the Old South Church of Boston and author of *A Body of Divinity* (1726), who spoke against all "dominion over the consciences of men" and lamented the "woful neglect to know the mind of Christ." (2) Recognition of the Divine revelation through nature and reason as consonant with that of Scripture, such as that so ably set forth by John Wise of Ipswich in his *Vindication of the Government of the New England Churches* (1717) and later by Ebenezer Gay of Hingham in his Dupleian lectures of 1759. (3) Insistence upon freedom of the will. Predestination and imputation naturally met with vigorous and repeated

denial. Every now and then a defender of freedom arose from the very midst of Calvinism to inveigh against its fatalism. Among such were Samuel West of New Bedford, Samuel Webster of Salisbury, Experience Mayhew, missionary to the Indians, and many others. The extent to which this departure from strict Calvinism had gone by the year 1806 is indicated in the famous compromise creed of Andover Seminary, which declared that "God's decrees perfectly consist with human liberty" — just *how* is not stated. (4) Declarations in favor of the Divine Unity as opposed to the crass, current tritheism. Among these "anti-trinitarians" were Jonathan Mayhew and Charles Chauncy of Boston, Thomas Barnard of Newburg, and William Bentley and John Prince of Salem. It has been customary to term these and their sympathizers "Arians" because they insisted upon the subordination of Christ to the Father. It would have been quite as exact to call them "Origenists" or even "Athanasians." The fact is, they had no thorough historic or theoretic knowledge of the doctrine of the Trinity. The sum of their anti-trinitarianism was a protest against the caricature of the doctrine then prevalent. (5) Affirmation of faith in the Divine Love and Fatherhood, which found no place in the Calvinism of the Westminster standards. This included a wider application of the Atonement (e.g. *The Meritorious Price of our Redemption* (1650) by William Pynchon of Springfield, a layman), and a more merciful fate for the non-elect. This liberalism went so far in several instances as to result in out-and-out Universalism, such as appears in Charles Chauncy's *Salvation of All Men* (1784) and Joseph Huntington's *Calvinism Improved* (1796).

These bold departures from the accepted doctrine were met by denunciation and attempted refutation; but the significant fact is that *the remonstrants, as a rule, remained within the pale of the general fellowship and neither re-*

*garded themselves as schismatics nor were censured by any ecclesiastical action.*¹ The fundamental reason for this lay in the very constitution and idea of New England Congregationalism, which held that the covenant, not the creed, is the constitutive principle of the individual church and that the pastor is answerable for his doctrinal views to his own church only. Although therefore from the first Calvinism was the accepted form of doctrine — the Cambridge Platform (1648) approving “for the substance thereof” the doctrine of the Westminster Confession² — it was the *government* of the church, “the parties of which are all of them exactly described in the Word of God,”³ departure from which was the most serious offence.

Moreover there is no evidence that these “inconsistent Calvinists” made any noticeable attempt to form a sect or party to antagonize their brethren. They simply gave free utterance to truth that came to them and submitted it to the Christian consciousness and reason of their hearers, their readers, and their associates. The fact, germane and honorable to the Congregational fellowship, is that there was a place for these independent minds, warm though it may have been — or perhaps, one should say *cold* — within the common body. They not only did not form a party; they did not even form a wing. They were the fearless spokesmen of new truth “breaking forth from God’s word.”

To class these early representatives of a freer and more progressive faith then as Unitarians is unwarranted. They were not Unitarians, for the simple reason that Unitarianism had not then come into existence.

Unitarianism arose as a coöperative, purposeful movement, with a definite existence and character of its own.

¹ The treatment of William Pynchon was a marked exception.

² See Williston Walker; Congregationalists (American Church History Series), p. 160.

³ Ibid. p. 162.

It originated when ministers and churches sought each other with the sense of a common consciousness and a common mission. It began when these associates commenced to say "we" and not "I."

By common consent the "magna charta" of American Unitarianism is Channing's Baltimore sermon of 1819. Throughout this sermon—though the term "Unitarian" does not appear—one of the most significant features is the constant recurrence of the term "we." "We" hold thus and thus. It is the symbol of the birth of a Unitarian consciousness. It marks the emergence of a new self-centred segregate. In a later utterance of Channing, *Objections to Unitarian Christianity Considered*, this consciousness, coupled with the frequent use of the term "Unitarians," was still more pronounced and aggressive. Thenceforth it developed rapidly and at length led to organization and propaganda. It would be assuming too much to say that this segregation was not provoked, perhaps compelled. All that I desire to point out is that this corporate consciousness and doctrinal consensus were essential to the very existence of Unitarianism as such and that prior to it there was no real "Unitarianism." It is of no slight importance that it be kept in mind that original and pure American Congregationalism was not, as has been said, a system of doctrine but a way of government,⁴ and that it had room within it, as it developed, both for an expansion of its idea of the "Way" and also for independent, outspoken theological thought. It was the false and misguided, not the true, representatives of the New England churches who finally closed the door to doctrinal freedom and development. Had there been more of Christian liberality and grace and wisdom on both sides, there would have been room also for the movement which became Unitarianism within the general

⁴ This was quite correctly though not quite amicably argued by the Unitarians. The claim provoked resentment, even denial, because converted into capital for controversy.

body. That, however, is past. Of more concern is it to trace the theological development of the two separating branches and to endeavor to see how they stand related to each other theologically at the present time.

III

The history of the bi-linear theology after the great separation is full of interest and significance. Like two divergent streams from the same source the two dissentient theologies flowed on, now drawing apart, now approaching one another, never without mutual interaction and influence.

The Trinitarian branch moved farther and father from its original source in the Westminster theology out into the warmth and freedom of a more expansive faith. It had long chafed within the narrow banks of Calvinism and had worn the channel wider and wider under the guise of "improvements." "The entire history of theology in New England," as Dr. Munger once remarked, "may be called an improvement."⁵ But improvements soon gave way to something more radical. It was not long after the rise of Unitarianism that the New England theology began, through the operation of its own inner life process, to break up. President Dwight published his *Theology* of softened Calvinism in 1818. Ten years later Nathaniel W. Taylor delivered his famous *Concio ad Clerum* in New Haven, in which he made the then revolutionary assertion that "sin is man's own act, consisting in a free choice of some object rather than God as his chief good." This was followed by the long and ardent controversy over Taylorism that shook the New England theology to its depths. Later came Charles G. Finney with his evangel of free choice of salvation based upon virtual repudiation of Calvinistic election. A more

⁵ Benjamin W. Bacon: Theodore Thornton Munger, p. 345.

deeply spiritual and pervasive solvent of the old doctrines was introduced by James Marsh of Vermont University in his epochal publication of Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection* (1840), opening as it did a new fountain of thought and life in the desert of conventional materialistic theology.

Yet the New England theology lingered on, not only in the backward pulpits of conservatism, but in such a centre of light and leading as Andover, where it produced its last brilliant exponent in Edwards A. Park. The new day of larger and freer things did not fully dawn until Horace Bushnell's fresh and emancipating thought had won its way to wide recognition. Then the new wine began to be poured into new wine-skins. The New England theology passed into abandonment and decadence. The transition was not made wholly without conflict and bitterness. Both the honored American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and Andover Seminary were almost rent in twain by the effort to substitute a humane doctrine of the determination of human destiny and the wider mission of Christ for the old dogma of the eternal damnation of the heathen. But in each case the schism was healed and further separation avoided.

The "New Theology," as it has grown up within the Congregational fellowship under such thinkers as Horace Bushnell, Henry Ward Beecher, Theodore T. Munger, Egbert C. Smyth, Lyman Abbott, Newman Smyth, George A. Gordon, and others, while it has developed in close contact with the wider movement in the same direction, exhibits a peculiarly clear and comprehensive form of the "new" doctrines. These doctrines were inherent in original Christianity but obscured and inhibited under the reign of Calvinism. Restored and developed into a large and initial whole, they may be summarized thus: (1) Divine immanence, prominent in Greek theology

but obscured in Latin theology, ignored in Augustinianism and hence in Calvinism, which was the most pronounced Protestant form of Augustinianism; (2) the witness of the Christian consciousness or experience, as contrasted with the external authority of the written word; (3) continuous creation, as contrasted with static creation, regarding man as evolved physically from nature, though spiritually born from above; (4) salvation, social as well as individual; (5) Christ the centre of the Christian revelation, his incarnation interpreting and fulfilling all other incarnations and his suffering and death revealing the divine law of atonement.

So sharp is the contrast between these distinctive doctrines of yesterday and today and those of the theology that prevailed from the time of the founding of Massachusetts to the downfall of the New England theology, that it seems difficult to trace any continuity whatever between them. Yet there is a continuity. It consists (1) in a deep underlying substratum of common conviction, and (2) in an intellectual and spiritual devotion to religious truth as intense and unflagging as any the human mind has witnessed. Such continuous loyalty to truth forms a bond as strong as ever linked a spiritual succession. The fruit of it is no poor conformity, or uniformity, of intellectual belief, nor any passive development of one type of doctrine from another, but a heroic recognition of the imperative obligation of serious thought upon the problems of religion which survives in some degree even today among the sons of the Pilgrims and Puritans.

It is true that, as President Tucker has pointed out, speculation has given place to inquiry.⁶ Successors of the New England theologians hold back from the speculative daring of the fathers who, as Dr. Munger has said,

⁶ "No one, I am sure, can overlook the immense moral gain which has taken place through the transfer of thought in so large degree from speculation to sober inquiry." William J. Tucker; *Idealism in Education; Public-mindedness*, p. 314.

“waived nothing”;⁷ but neither their courage nor their love of truth has been wholly lost.

IV

When we turn to the history of Unitarian theology, we find here also not stagnation nor retrogression but agitation, controversy, advance. Unitarian thought did not, could not, stop where Channing left it. It had its own course to run, its own problems to meet, its own findings to work out. Protest was its original mission, but it could not live upon protest.

One of the first of these issues was to determine its own conception of Christianity as a religion and of Christ as its founder. This was no light task. It called for constructive thought; and the early Unitarians were not strong in constructive thinking. Protest was far simpler and at first sorely needed. Channing was a genuine master of protest. Ethically sound and virile, intellectually clear and discerning, he exposed the fallacies and inconsistencies of orthodoxy with prophetic power and indignation, though not always with full justice. His protest against a degraded and degrading conception of humanity was not only sound but, as Dr. George A. Gordon has said, it was “a revival of the New Testament interpretation of human nature.”⁸ His attack on the doctrine of the Trinity — directed against a “Trinitarianism” prevalent in his day but which had no more resemblance to original and genuine Trinitarianism than had the New England Primer to the Nicene Creed — was largely justified. As prophet and reformer Channing was unrivalled, in Christian character and devotion resplendent, but as theologian he was neither learned nor profound. Nor did early Unitarianism possess any outstanding constructive theologian.

⁷ Horace Bushnell, p. 38.

⁸ *Ultimate Conceptions of Faith*, p. 34.

The notable fact about early American Unitarianism is the radicalism of its protests and the conservatism of its products. As a protest against a narrow doctrine of man and a "deformed" tritheism it was, as Dr. Gordon contends, "wholesome, magnificent, providential."⁹ But as a positive constructive force it was slow in getting on its feet. It did not know what to do with miracles, and so accepted them. It did not know how to forge a new and better conception of Christianity, and so fell back on the old one. When it came to formulating a doctrinal account of itself, the American Unitarian Association in 1853 unanimously adopted a resolution declaring that "the Divine authority of the Gospel, as founded on a special and miraculous interposition of God, is the basis of the action of the Association."¹⁰ The instinctive loyalty of this declaration to the unique nature and mission of Christianity is commendable, but its perception of the true character of this mission is dull and commonplace enough. "A special and miraculous interposition" sounds like an echo from the wastes of Protestant scholasticism.

Across the barren desert of this theological impotence and lethargy rang the voice of a fresh and unfettered thinker, Theodore Parker. Here at length was an original and contributive mind; a giant, with a giant's strength — and weakness — rugged, human, forceful; too little balanced and reflective to be a great theologian, but bringing genuine opulence as well as candor to the Unitarian cause. At first the lately stoned prophets were for stoning this new prophet sprung from their own ranks, but—they thought better of it, and in due time built him a monument as to one of their chosen vessels. Parker's great sermon on *The Transient and Permanent in Christianity* (1841) — now regarded as the second of

⁹ *The Christ of Today*, p. 37.

¹⁰ Cooke: *Unitarianism in America*, p. 157.

the three chief documents of Unitarianism, though at the time greeted with condemnation and contumely — had a salutary influence upon Unitarianism. Though marred here and there, as Chadwick says, with a “purple patch of rhetoric,” it is a noble setting forth of the essential elements of Christianity, rich in true thought and feeling. Its distinction between doctrine and the greater reality behind it had in it the promise of a new day. Yet its conception of Christ and of the relation of his person to his words is hazy and ill-defined and lacks the sense of his redeeming power. This latter deficiency is not singular, since sin and evil find little place in Parker’s *Weltanschauung*.

Parker, with all his defects, was a great force, intellectual and religious, and with the larger-minded men of the fellowship, like Hedge, Clarke, and Bellows, saved Unitarian Christianity from lapsing into blank supernaturalism, on the one hand, and mere morality on the other. Above all, did he and they save Unitarianism from the dismal barrenness of a “mere man” conception of Him in whom “the godlike and the human met and embraced and a divine life was born.”¹¹ The incipient tendency to reduce Jesus to the dimensions and influence of “the man you may meet any day in the street” seems to have now completely vanished from Unitarianism.

A second issue which Unitarianism had to face was raised by its attitude toward other religions. Predisposed toward catholicity and sympathy with other faiths and stimulated by the studies of its own scholars in this field, Unitarianism more than once seemed in danger of substituting eclecticism for Christianity, of losing its own identity in its effort to touch hands with every alien religious aspiration, however distant or vagrant.

This inner and subtle peril was felt by the organizers of the National Unitarian Conference in 1865. For, after

¹¹ The Transient and Permanent in Christianity.

much discussion, a clause was inserted in the conference platform stating that its members are "Disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ." To offset this apparent illiberality and promote wider affiliations, the Free Religious Association was organized in Boston in 1867. The friction caused by these divergent points of view continued for many years. It entered into the controversy with the Western Unitarian Association, which was bent upon adopting into Unitarianism every form of righteousness and every impulse toward a higher life. Slowly, however, the Unitarian body as a whole came to the consciousness that to be coherent it must be Christian and that to be Christian it must keep in touch with Jesus Christ. This conviction found expression at the national conference at Saratoga in 1894 in the declaration commencing, "These churches accept the religion of Jesus," etc., and later in the adoption of the clause "the leadership of Jesus" in the denominational Confession.

A third issue which the Unitarians had to meet, and one of peculiar difficulty, was the choice between theism and pantheism, or perhaps one should say between theism and monism. This issue was unconsciously thrust upon them by their greatest prophet and personality — *with* them yet not quite *of* them — Ralph Waldo Emerson. This is not to say that Emerson was himself a pantheist. He vibrated between pantheism and theism and only in his maturer thought came to equilibrium in theism. Much of his teaching, however, is so far pantheistic as to be both unchristian and unmoral. The famous Divinity School Address of 1838 — sometimes accounted the third great utterance of Unitarianism — full though it is of sweetness and light, is but a sorry version of the real substance of the Christian message. Underneath all the foolish disparagement with which it was assailed by Unitarians as well as by orthodox, lay the instinctive consciousness that this was neither true Christianity nor true Unitarianism.

No great seer and sage ever called for closer discrimination in the reception of his message than Emerson. While Unitarianism has been not a little misled by his vaguer and more naturalistic sentiments, it is upon the whole an evidence of its spiritual stability that it has not been more completely confused by its great prophet and deflected from vital ethics and theism. In the main it has stored his wheat and burned his chaff — or at least left it in the field for weaker minds to mistake for grain.

But what of Transcendentalism? Was not that a by-path into which Unitarianism strayed and from which it returned to the main road confused and exhausted? On the contrary, the Unitarian attachment to Transcendentalism — which was a movement far wider than its ranks — was on the whole an evidence of intellectual and spiritual sensitiveness. For Transcendentalism, when reduced to its essence, meant reliance upon moral and spiritual intuition as over against the crass materialism and rationalism of orthodoxy. It was a nineteenth-century rendering of the second chapter of First Corinthians. If it was not the “whole gospel,” it was a needed philosophical *prolegomenon* of it. It stood for the truth that spiritual things must be spiritually discerned — though by no means as well able to coördinate this truth with the practical application of the gospel as was Paul. Here again, to be sure, there were transcendental lapses and lispings on the part of weaker brethren, and sometimes on the part of stronger; but in the large, Transcendentalism laid hold of a genuine principle and helped to establish the self-evidencing nature of moral and spiritual truth.¹²

¹² While Unitarianism, through the fear of dogmatic systemism, has been hesitant about launching theological systems, and thus has contributed less to the science of theology than it might otherwise have done, it has never lost interest in the intellectual apprehension of religion. The one outstanding text-book in theology produced by American Unitarianism, Professor C. C. Everett's posthumous *Theism and the Christian Faith*, is characterized by learning, philosophic judgment, and breadth, and, although of the Neo-Hegelian school modified by Schleiermacher, deliberately presents the theistic doctrine of God as well as the absoluteness of Christianity.

On the whole, the history of American Unitarian theology shows that it has escaped serious pitfalls, has assimilated the best and strongest and rejected the worst and weakest in the movements which have arisen within or about it, and has — like its kindred denomination — advanced steadily in its apprehension and interpretation of “pure Christianity.”

V

In the light of this conclusion we may go on to attempt to estimate the present theological situation as relates to the two branches of original New England Congregationalism on the eve of its tercentenary. What have the two fellowships in common? What have they of a distinctive and separative character? And how can they draw closer together for a common task in these urgent days that call for the greatest possible Christian unity?

In the first place, it must be evident that each fellowship has much to repent of in its treatment of the other, the Trinitarians of bitterness and scorn in their attitude toward Unitarians, the Unitarians of intemperance and injustice in their denunciations of Trinitarians. There have been acts too as well as words that were neither charitable nor Christian, such as the exclusion of Unitarians from Congregational pulpits on the one side, and on the other the appropriation of church property on the basis of a claim which was legal rather than equitable. The injustice of this latter action has been recently magnanimously admitted by a well-known Unitarian who adds his tribute to “the splendid loyalty to conscience which inspired the conservatives to depart from an organization which they deemed hostile to the Christian faith.”¹³ Is it not time that we of

¹³ Dean W. W. Fenn: *The Religious History of New England*. Harvard University Press (1917), p. 111.

the Trinitarian lineage acknowledged that the charge of "robbery" preferred against the Unitarians was also unjust? The old bitterness and jealousy have now happily at length passed away, though not a little of prejudice and suspicion lingers — far less in New England, significantly, especially about Boston, than in parts of the country where less of the whole matter is known.

Endeavors toward mutual understanding and good will, both courageous and Christian, have frequently been made — notable among them those of Horace Bushnell, Cyrus Bartol, T. T. Munger, James Freeman Clarke, George A. Gordon, and Starr King. The latter's "memorable" sermon — *Spiritual Christianity* — is one of the strongest, most scholarly, and most eloquent of irenic sermons, and is as timely today as when it was delivered.

Probably the volume that has done most to interpret the opposing parties to each other is James Freeman Clarke's *Truths and Errors of Orthodoxy*, which appeared in 1866. Clarke, in the judgment of the writer, was the ablest theologian as well as one of the finest characters American Unitarianism has produced, and this book is one of the most penetrative and discriminating contributions to American theology. Its extensive circulation has given it a wide and beneficial influence, and the name of its author deserves honor and gratitude from these kindred bodies and from all lovers of truth and fairness.

The doctrinal issues between the two fellowships are now to a large degree obsolete, for the simple reason that the whole theological situation has changed. We are in another theological era. Old things are passed away, all is new — viewpoint, task, outlook. That does not mean the denial of continuity but the confirmation of it. It would be impossible, for instance, to revive the controversy over the doctrine of the Trinity as it once raged.

The assertion has often been made and is quite warranted, that neither side in the contest fully understood the doctrine, either historically or philosophically. This is well illustrated by a statement of Dr. Andrew P. Peabody, who was far better acquainted with the history of doctrine than most of his contemporaries, that "the Nicene creed is expressly *anti-trinitarian*, making Christ a derived and thus of necessity a subordinate being"¹⁴—as if derivation, or at least differentiation in unity, were not essential to the very essence of the doctrine of the Trinity, except as the New England tritheism had perverted it. How significant was it of the change of attitude, or of atmosphere, when Dr. Hedge declared, "We cannot be too thankful that the Athanasian view prevailed against the Arian which recognizes no divinity in man"¹⁵!

With respect to the nature and destiny of man, Congregationalism has come far closer in its later development to Channing's reverent and noble appraisal of human worth at its best, though it has carried into it also a perception of the darker side of human nature such as neither Channing nor his successors grasped but which history, especially of late, has amply confirmed.

In its doctrine of Christ, Unitarianism has been as vacillating and vague as Congregationalism has been dogmatic and conventional. Both are coming to see in him far more than either originally saw.

VI

The two fellowships are undoubtedly drawing nearer together as they move forward, in common with the whole body of Christians, into a larger conception of Christianity and its cardinal truths. Yet the statement

¹⁴ Unitarianism: Its Origin and History, p. 156. (Italics mine.)

¹⁵ Reason in Religion, p. 238; quoted by Charles A. Allen, in Unitarianism of Today, p. 11.

of Dean Fenn that the "two bodies have arrived, each in its own way, at substantially similar theological conclusions on the points once at issue," is open to question.¹⁶ In spite of very large agreements, there are still substantial differences which it is no gain to overlook. Perhaps the most deeply rooted divergence concerns human nature, or in other words the doctrine of sin. Here, it seems to most Congregationalists, the Unitarians have always been and still are inclined to a superficial optimism which is untrue to reality. The article, for instance, in the Unitarian Confession affirming belief in "the Progress of Mankind onward and upward forever," while provoking no positive dissent, seems to the sterner Puritan lineage essentially misleading because of what it fails to recognize — namely, the great struggle and cost of progress and the need of divine succor which it involves. Progress is a great, a divine truth, but it is not so near to the heart of Christianity as redemption, and divorced from redemption progress is but a roseate naturalistic self-deception.

Retaining a deep sense of the need of redemption, most Congregationalists cannot satisfy themselves with merely affirming "the leadership of Jesus." That leadership they gladly acknowledge and they see that it involves, if carried through, the transformation of the whole structure of society from bottom to top — social, educational, international. But they seek and find in Jesus Christ also a necessary dynamic, an impelling power, enabling men to do the things which they know they ought to do under his leadership but which they fail to do for lack of strength and impulse until they find in him "the power of God unto salvation." Perhaps it may be chargeable to a survival of something of the old inclination to rest back upon a Higher Power which characterizes Calvinism, but at all events the more

¹⁶ Religious History of New England, p. 132.

conservative branch of the lineage of the Pilgrims retains more of a sense of dependence upon God and is inclined to put quite as much stress upon the second part of that ringing exclamation of Paul, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me," as upon the first. Moreover they find in the long-abused doctrine of atonement a recognition of the place which sacrificial, vicarious — though not substitutionary — suffering has in human redemption which their Unitarian brethren do not seem as yet fully to recognize.

In the conception of God too there is a difference of shading, if not of substance. If, as Dean Fenn states, the Unitarians have gone over to a "Calvinism of immanence,"¹⁷ the Trinitarians, while sharing to the full the doctrine of immanence, have endeavored to retain also the doctrine of transcendence, believing both to be essential to Divine Fatherhood.

VII

With these theological divergences — in spite of so much in common — still remaining, can the two fellowships come closer together? How can two walk together unless they are agreed? Clearly they cannot unless they have enough of agreement to undergird their differences. On the other hand, if they were absolutely agreed in every particular and point of view, of what stimulus were walking together? What is the case with these two disparted companies of disciples? Have they enough in common and enough that is original and distinctive to make a closer comradeship contributive to the common good? Certainly they have, along with their divergences, a great deal in common doctrinally. Yet there is a far more fundamental unity than that of doctrinal consent, essential to genuine sympathy and fellowship,

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 129.

and that is experiential unity. Have these two bodies a common and uniting Christian experience?

There is a very prevalent impression among "Evangelical" bodies that Unitarians are lacking in spiritual life, that though they may abound in prayer and good works, they have not so much as heard that there is a Holy Ghost, that their religion is almost wholly moral and intellectual and very little experimental and communicative. Perhaps there has been some ground for this assumption. Unitarianism has clearly been characterized by a certain aloofness, a self-consciousness, at times painful to others, if not to itself. Unitarianism is, of all Christian bodies, the most analytical and introspective. It is almost pathetic to note how many attempts Unitarians have made to define themselves. The effort began with Channing and has been continued by President Eliot, Professor Emerton, Charles W. Wendte, Charles G. Ames, M. J. Savage, E. A. Horton, S. M. Crothers, S. A. Eliot, Howard N. Brown, William L. Sullivan, and, one might almost add, all other Unitarians. Such excessive self-examination is not edifying. It reminds one of the extreme morbidness, in individual experience, of a John Bunyan or a David Brainerd; only unfortunately there is very little of denominational penitence and self-reproach in it. It is in its way almost as bad as "such boastings" as the Congregationalists use, "or lesser breeds without the law," and makes one wonder if we are not all, after all, "miserable sinners."

Yet it is not this which has been complained of in the Unitarians so much as their frigidity. Did not Emerson himself call Unitarianism an "ice chest"? And yet in the utterances of representative American Unitarians — as Charles A. Allen has so conclusively shown in his *Unitarianism of Today* — preference has often been given to the religion of the heart over that of the head. "It

was of the very essence of the liberal movement," declares John W. Chadwick, "to emphasize the ethical and spiritual." "It is of less moment," asserted Hedge, "that the intellect should form a perfect conception than that the heart should have perfect conviction." "Religion is not a theory for the understanding, but a life to the soul," wrote J. H. Allen.¹⁸ And one of the latest and best interpreters of Unitarianism, Professor Christie, holds that "the first and fundamental characteristic of Unitarianism is that it is an undogmatic church" and that religious union begins "whenever two souls recognize in one another a direct, real, and inward contact with the divine life."¹⁹ It may be objected that these are individual utterances and do not reflect the temper of the body as a whole. However that may be, the tendency of Unitarianism today is certainly in the direction of greater warmth and outgo of spiritual life. The recent interest in mysticism and the preaching mission attest this. Who would have dreamed ten years ago of a Unitarian revival? Nor are these mere sporadic efforts to make the wheels go round, but evidences of a genuine spiritual renaissance throughout the Unitarian body.

It is neither right nor Christian to let outgrown issues determine present attitudes. Theology must be justified of her children. If there is to be continued, upon the part of the "Evangelical" churches, a policy of withholding fellowship from Unitarianism upon theological ground, it must be made clear that it is based upon actual theological disharmonies sufficient to warrant so unbrotherly an attitude.

Yet this paper is not intended for the purpose of raising an issue but of surveying a great theological movement dating from the very beginnings of New England. I

¹⁸ Unitarianism of Today, pp. 30-31.

¹⁹ Francis A. Christie; Unitarianism. American Journal of Theology, October, 1917, p. 555.

have dealt with it in only one of its denominational aspects. A larger treatment would require consideration of other denominational theological relationships.

As one looks back upon the movement of American theology since 1620 it can hardly be without a sense of gratitude for the progress that has been made, not only in truth but in charity. There is reason for thankfulness, not only that the old controversies have died out, but that the very spirit of controversy, which was the animus of separation, has fallen into desuetude. Looking back from this distance it seems strange that controversial theology ever had such vogue, that the idea and practice of polemics could ever have assumed so large a place in minds so sweet and strong. The whole method of attack and defence is alien to the spirit of Christianity, a corollary perhaps of the obsolete philosophy of war as a method of settling differences.

Great indeed is the cause for gratitude that we of this generation have come — through little virtue or achievement of our own — out of the atmosphere of controversy into one of friendliness, in which we can not only work together but reason together concerning the great things of the kingdom. Along this open road, leading on to larger truth and deeper unity, we of the Pilgrim lineage may walk in generous fellowship with one another and with all our fellow Christians, assured that in so doing we shall lose nothing of the high purpose and true spirit of the fathers.

RECENT EXCAVATIONS AT BABYLON

DAVID GORDON LYON

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Through the pages of its *Mittheilungen*, of which 55 numbers appeared prior to 1915, the German Orient Society has kept its members informed concerning the excavations which since 1899 it has been conducting in the East. The more technical details have from time to time appeared in the *Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen* issued by the Society. That Assyria and Babylon have been a field of special attractiveness seems natural for a Society the inception and direction of which have been in large measure the work of the eminent Assyriologist Friedrich Delitzsch. It is due to his enthusiasm that the Society has secured such large financial support that it could project and execute plans on a scale and with a degree of thoroughness not seen before in the Babylonian-Assyrian territory. The friendly relations between the German and Turkish governments have likewise greatly eased the path of the explorer.

The two sites which have received most attention have been Babylon and the Assyrian capital, Asshur. The work at Babylon lacks of course the interest that belongs to the excavations of the French at Khorsabad and Tel-loh or of the English at Nineveh and Calah, but this is no fault of the explorer. The literary and art remains of Babylon were for the most part less well preserved than those of the other sites named.

But Babylon has an interest, apart from its ruins, peculiarly its own. It is the site of the Tower of Babel, the home of the power which destroyed the Jewish State,

the scene of Daniel's triumph and of Belshazzar's feast, and it occupies a large space in the utterances of Hebrew prophets. Greek and Roman writers describe at length its greatness and splendor in the period just prior to its sudden fall, and especially its palaces, temples, fortifications, bridges, quays, and hanging gardens, built by Nebuchadnezzar. The native records which we have from this monarch never weary in dealing with these subjects. Impressed on clay cylinders and tablets from many of the ruins of Babylonia, and carved on stone slabs at Babylon and even on the steep sides of the mountains of Lebanon, these records give us much information about the city at the time of its greatest power and magnificence. Cyrus has informed us with what joy the Babylonians welcomed his victorious entry into the city. With its change of masters Babylon became one of the capitals of the Persian empire, but it declined greatly during the Persian period. Alexander had the intention to make it the capital of his new world-empire, and actually began preparations for its rebuilding, but sudden death put an end to his brilliant dream.

Through all the centuries of decay the ancient name has been preserved on the spot. It is now attached to the most northerly of the three mounds on which the larger buildings of the city stood. This mound, Babil by name, contains the remains of one of the palaces built by Nebuchadnezzar. Amran, the most southerly mound, is the site of Marduk's temple Esagil, the most famous temple of Babylon. Between Babil and Amran is the mound called by the natives Kasr, wherein lie the remains of the chief palace of Nebuchadnezzar. These three mounds are all on the eastern side of the Euphrates. But the course of that stream has suffered many shifts, and it appears at one period to have run to the east of the Kasr. If this be the case, it would, as pointed out by Robert Koldewey, director of the German excava-

tions at Babylon, explain the statement of Greek historians that the two palaces of Nebuchadnezzar were on opposite sides of the river.

For several centuries the site of Babylon has been known to the western world. It has in modern times been repeatedly visited, and in the past century was the scene of a certain amount of superficial excavation. Various considerations have tended to discourage exploration at this spot. Among these are the vastness of the ruins, the ill success of the initial tests, and the comparative ease and success of exploration elsewhere. What Koldewey's predecessors accomplished is accordingly relatively insignificant. No one of them was in a position to lay plans commensurate with the largeness of the undertaking. Even Koldewey, with the large resources of money and time at his command, has scarcely half completed the task. Certain large results have been achieved, but many smaller problems still await their solution by the spade. The excavations have been confined almost entirely to the mounds, wherein the ruins of the larger buildings lie. The lower levels, burying the streets and houses of the successive periods of the city, are still largely untouched by the excavator.

Koldewey's book, which in the original bears the title *Das Wieder Erstehende Babylon*, appeared in 1913, and reports what was accomplished at Babylon between March, 1899, and May, 1912. In this period the work went on almost without interruption.

The book contains in its preface an epitomized diary of the work. The record of the excavations is given in 52 sections. This is followed by an appendix with extracts from the writings of Herodotus and other classical historians, a table of contents, and a list of the illustrations. The translation into English¹ adds an index of

¹ The Excavations at Babylon, with 255 Illustrations and Plans. Robert Koldewey. Tr. by Agnes S. Johns. Macmillan & Co., 1914. Pp. xx, 335. \$5.25.

seven pages, a list of the publications of the Orient Society, and an important note concerning a cuneiform description of the great temple Esagil.

About one half of the book is devoted to the Kasr, the central mound, the site of Nebuchadnezzar's chief palace. This mound is about 600 metres north and south and about 500 east and west. Here were unearthed the palace, the Procession Street, and the temple of the goddess Ninmach. In places only foundations remained, in other places portions of the massive walls were in position. Here as everywhere else in the ruins enormous damage has been done to the buildings by the modern natives, who dig out the bricks for present use, the building of houses, and making of dams.

The palace on the mound consisted of two parts, a southern and a northern. The enclosing wall of the southern half forms a trapezium, with sides measuring approximately 280, 320, 190, and 125 metres. Here stood once the palace of Nebuchadnezzar's father, which the son rebuilt, enlarged, and adorned. The main entrance seems to have been on the east, where a massive gateway leads into a court about 40 by 60 metres in size. Across this court is a passage into a second court about 40 by 35 metres, and beyond this a third about 50 by 60 metres near the centre of the great complex of buildings. On the south side of this third court are three doors leading into the largest and finest hall in the ruin, a room about 53 by 18 metres. Here were found richly colored tiles with elaborate ornamentation representing figures of columns, garlands, and animal forms. Koldewey thinks that this was Nebuchadnezzar's throne room. A recess or niche in the southern wall of the room may have been the spot where the royal throne stood. The rest of the southern half of the Kasr is occupied by a great number of passage-ways, halls, and chambers. The chambers were doubtless the sleeping apartments, offices,

and store-rooms of the palace. A massive group of vaults in the north-east corner of the enclosure is believed by Koldewey to be the substructions of the hanging gardens.

The northern half of the mound was excavated only in small part, but enough was done to show that it contains the large extension of the palace in this direction of which we learn in the records of Nebuchadnezzar.

Running north and south on the eastern side of the palace, and extending as far south as the temple of Esagil, is the most celebrated street of Babylon, the so-called Procession Street of Marduk, along which the chief god of Babylon was at times borne in stately procession. This street is paved with blocks of breccia, and the walls enclosing it on either side were decorated with enamelled tiles representing lions, bulls, and dragons. Near the corner identified with the hanging gardens the street passes through the most elaborate gateway of Babylon, the Ishtar gate, often mentioned in the records of Nebuchadnezzar. The massive pillars of this gateway are likewise decorated with similar figures. The dragons have the body of a beast covered with the scales of a serpent, the fore feet of a beast, the hind feet of a bird, and the head and tail of a serpent. Koldewey estimates that there were several hundred of these animal figures.

On the eastern side of the Procession Street and near the Ishtar gate lie the ruins of the temple of Ninmach, which may have served as the palace temple. In size it is about 50 by 30 metres, and it is not quite rectangular. The entrance is in the northern wall, and the adytum is near the opposite southern wall of the temple. In front of the outer door was a small altar built of brick. A vestibule, with a porter's room on the left, leads to a central court about 20 by 14 metres. Beneath the floor of the court is a well. On the south side of the court is a

room about 12 by 5 metres, with a smaller chamber or closet at one end. Passing through the larger chamber we enter another of the same size. This is the adytum. Facing the door is the platform on which the statue of the god had stood or sat. There had been three of these platforms, one above the other, necessitated by successive elevations of the floor. Two of these were still in place. Underneath the lowest was a brick receptacle containing a clay statuette in human form with a thin staff of gold in one hand. Grouped around the temple court are several chambers, also certain long corridors of uncertain use. A foundation record of Assurbanipal's found in the temple shows that this Assyrian king had restored the building while his brother was ruling at Babylon. From inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar we know that he also built the temple anew.

In addition to the temple just described three other temples were excavated besides Esagil. All were more elaborate than the temple of Ninmach, but the arrangements of the interior were much the same. Others still await discovery, for we read in the inscriptions the names of several not yet found.

A reminder of the Persian period of Babylon is found in the ill-preserved remains of a Persian building which stood on one side of the Kasr mound. The identification is based on the architectural features of the building, which repeat those of the Persepolitan palaces. It is confirmed by the discovery of fragments of stone with several letters in the Persian cuneiform script. Koldewey thinks that he recognizes in them part of the name of Darius.

Some 1700 metres north of the Kasr lies Babil, an imposing mound, the site of Nebuchadnezzar's second palace. Though the excavation was only partial, inscriptions found there leave no doubt as to the identification. The mound is nearly square, with approximately 500 metres

to the side. In the records of Nebuchadnezzar the name Babil ordinarily means the city, but sometimes the citadel or what is now the Kasr. This double use of the name is the source of some confusion in the interpretation of the inscriptions. Particularly has that been the case in regard to two great walls of Babylon, Imgur Bel and Nimitti Bel. The excavations have shown that these were walls in connection with Babil in the narrower sense — the Kasr palace — and not the more northerly mound now known as Babil. What led to the transfer of the name from one mound to the other we do not know.

About 3000 metres south of Babil is the large mound Amran, of irregular shape, the site of Marduk's temple Esagil. This temple, for many centuries the most important building at Babylon, was an object of reverent care to Babylonian and Assyrian kings from the days of Hammurabi. With all the other buildings at Babylon it suffered destruction at the hands of Sennacherib in or about the year 689 B.C. Esarhaddon restored the city, and Assurbanipal devoted much attention to Esagil. During the reign of the latter the statue of Marduk, which had been taken by Sennacherib as a trophy to Assyria, was restored to its shrine in Esagil. But naturally no Assyrian ruler would give to Babylonian temples such care as would a native king residing in the city. We find accordingly that Nabopolassar devoted special attention to Esagil. But it was under his son Nebuchadnezzar that this temple saw its most glorious days. Hardly any of his numerous records fail to describe at length or briefly his works of restoration. They tell us much about the temple proper, the bricks of its walls, the cedar of its roofing, the gold and silver with which it was adorned. They tell of its four imposing gates and of its three shrines, one to Marduk, one to his spouse Zirpanit, and one to their son Nabu, all brilliantly em-

bellished. They describe Marduk's elaborate procession-boat, in which the god was borne on certain festive occasions. They give long lists of the sacrifices and describe the Chamber of Destiny, in which annually in the new-year period the gods assembled around Marduk to declare the destinies for the year. They devote special attention to the temple-tower, on the top of which stood another shrine to Marduk.

But unfortunately these records and those of the succeeding kings do not furnish the data for a reconstruction of the plan of the temple. While telling of laying foundations as deep as the water-level, of building walls as firm as the mountain-rock, and of rearing the top of the tower mountain high, they give neither dimensions nor directions. The impression received from these descriptions is of large, massive, solid, and lofty structures, lavishly adorned. Perhaps naturally one thinks of the tower and the shrines as forming a group of buildings surrounded by a lofty wall entered through massive gateways. Nothing in the record tells us what was the form of the tower nor how the shrine at its top was reached, whether by stairway or by inclined plane, whether from within or without.

Herodotus, fortunately, answers some of our questions. True it is that he came after the decline of Babylon had set in, but it is not likely that the tower had undergone any radical change of form, and if it had, a correct tradition may well have survived. According to Herodotus the tower consisted of a series of eight stages or blocks, each smaller than the one below it, and the ascent was on the outside. The lowest stage was square in plan, each side measuring a stadium. The shrine at the top contained no image, but there was another temple lower down, that is, on the ground, with altars and a large golden image of the god. The temple precincts in this account formed a quadrangle, each side measuring two stadia.

Koldewey carried his excavations down to water-level at a depth of 23 metres below the surface, but what he found in the Amran coincides not at all with the tower and temple described by Herodotus. What the explorer identifies as Esagil is a structure in two parts, an eastern and a western. The western measures about 85 by 80 metres. The sides face the cardinal points, and each side near the middle has an entrance conducting into the large court in the central space. Six floors were recognized, representing six successive elevations of the floor-level. Two of these were from Nebuchadnezzar and two from the Assyrian king Assurbanipal. The uppermost floor was reached only after digging through $18\frac{1}{2}$ metres of débris. The enclosing walls of the building were six metres thick. Three shrines were recognized, on the west, south, and north sides respectively, one of them being that of Marduk.

The eastern portion of this temple covers about 90 by 115 metres. Four gates and several smaller openings lead into the interior. The excavations were not carried far enough to determine the details of the plan of this building, but inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal found at the floor-level seem to leave no doubt that it is a part of the great temple of Esagil. So great is the accumulation of débris at this point that to reach the floor involved the removal of 30,000 cubic metres of rubbish.

One may well ask whether this great structure in two parts is really Esagil, as Koldewey holds, or only an annex to the great temple. The main reasons for the doubt are that it is not inside the great enclosure where the remains of the tower lie, and particularly that the Procession Street does not skirt its wall as it does in the case of the enclosure. Elsewhere in Assyria and Babylonia the tower, the so-called *ziggurat*, is in close proximity to the temple, and we get the impression from Nebu-

chadnezzar and from Herodotus that this was the case with Esagil also. If this criticism is correct, Koldewey did not find the central part of Esagil at all. What remains of it is still to be sought in the unexcavated portion of the great enclosure.

The southern limit of this enclosure lies about 100 metres north of the buildings just described. The enclosure is nearly rectangular, measuring about 400 by 450 metres, and the walls are very massive. There are twelve gates. Built against the walls on the inside are many chambers, in all probability storerooms, apartments of temple-attendants, and, as Koldewey thinks, lodging-rooms for pilgrims.

A tower near the south-west corner of the enclosure, about 90 metres square, is held by the explorer to be Etemenanki, the celebrated tower of Esagil. This opinion is supported by several inscribed bricks of Assurbanipal and Nebuchadnezzar from the ruin relating to the reconstruction of Etemenanki. Leading up to this tower and perpendicular to its southern line is a steep stairway, from which Koldewey concludes that this was the only method of ascent, and that the current view is erroneous. This view, based on Herodotus, represents the ascent as made by passing around the tower in rising from one stage to the next higher. This view is supported by what the French explorers found in excavating the city of Sargon in the ruins of Khorsabad. Here was a tower altogether like what Herodotus describes at Babylon. Koldewey thinks that there was no such tower found at Khorsabad but that the French explorers, misled by Herodotus, saw what was in reality not in the ruins at all. But is not such an opinion an excess of scepticism? To justify his doubt it was necessary for Koldewey to question also the accuracy of a report of George Smith that he had seen in Paris a cuneiform tablet describing Marduk's temple at Baby-

lon and agreeing essentially with Herodotus as to the form of the tower. A note appended to the translation of Koldewey's book calls attention to the fact that this tablet, long lost to sight, has reappeared, and has been made the subject of an elaborate study by two competent French scholars. This study seems to show that Koldewey is in the wrong in his strictures on George Smith, the French explorers, and Herodotus. Indeed, notwithstanding all the excavation carried on in this enclosure, but little new information has been gained regarding Esagil and Etemenanki, and it is much to be feared that these buildings have suffered so greatly that no degree of excavation will ever be able to add much to our knowledge. Some of the dimensions given by Herodotus are doubtless exaggerations, but there seems to be no reason to doubt the general accuracy of his descriptions.

Marduk's Procession Street, coming from the Kasr in the north, skirts the great enclosure on the east and on the south, and crossed the Euphrates on a bridge near the south-west corner of the enclosure. Though the river has shifted its course, a depression in the ground shows where it formerly ran, and seven of the brick piers by which the bridge was supported were excavated. The piers are 21 metres long and 9 metres in width, and the seven cover a space 123 metres long. Along the ancient river bank running north and south from the end of the bridge are the remains of a wall erected by Nabunaid, the last native king of Babylon.

Some 500 metres east of the Kasr lies an extensive mound composed entirely of the débris of burned bricks. This débris seems to have come from the ruins of Etemenanki at the time when Alexander caused the site to be cleared away with the intention of rebuilding the tower. In this mound were excavated the remains of an extensive Greek theatre. The seats, which numbered about 30

rows, have a semicircular form with an extreme diameter of about 66 metres. Though very badly damaged, enough of the theatre remained to make possible a restoration of its plan. According to a Greek inscription in four lines, perfectly preserved except at the ends of the lines, this theatre was erected or restored by a certain Dioskouri(des). The original construction may well belong to the time of the occupation of the city by Alexander.

In the triangle formed by lines connecting the Kasr, Esagil, and the Greek theatre, lies a section of the ruins now known as Merkes. Here were excavated some of the streets and private houses coming from various periods of the history of the city. In the surface-layers, the first two or three metres, were found the sparse remains of houses of the Parthian period. The next four metres are from Greek, Persian, and late Babylonian times. The narrow streets run north and south, east and west. The houses are thickly crowded together, have massive walls made of sun-dried bricks, and good brick floors. Wells are frequent. One of the larger of the houses, apparently from the time of Nebuchadnezzar, contains 24 chambers grouped around two courts. It is somewhat irregular in shape, about 40 by 40 metres, and consists of two halves. The arrangement of the rooms suggests that part of the house was used as a dwelling and part for business purposes.

At a lower level, in the period 1400-1300 B.C. as appeared from dated tablets found at this level, the houses were less crowded. One metre below water-level were reached the ruins of the city of Hammurabi (about 2100 B.C.) and his successors. The houses have walls of sun-dried bricks resting on foundations of burned bricks. They are closely crowded together and less massive than those of the time of Nebuchadnezzar. The Babylon of a still earlier period lies now entirely under water, owing to the gradual rise of the river bed, the surface of the ter-

rain, and the water-level. The space in which these houses were excavated was in ancient times slightly higher than the general level of the city, with the result that in the lower sections the remains are buried still deeper below the water-level.

A section of the city wall on the north-east side was investigated. The wall is double, an inner and an outer, that is, with a space between filled in with earth. The inner wall, of sun-dried bricks, is about seven metres thick, with towers at frequent intervals; the outer, of burned bricks, about eight metres thick; and the intervening space about 12 metres. The whole wall has thus a thickness of about 27 metres. The original height could not be determined. Outside and close to the wall was the moat wall, three and a half metres thick. The moat itself had not been examined, nor had any of the city gates been found when Koldewey's book was written.

The ruins described by Koldewey lie all on the east side of the river. Assuming the correctness of the statement of Herodotus that the city lay on both sides of the river, Koldewey estimates that the circumference was about 18,000 metres. This is somewhat more than a fourth of that given by Ktesias and somewhat less than a fourth of the figure named by Herodotus. Finding no evidence of remains of walls enclosing a vastly larger area, Koldewey concludes that the statement of the ancient authors is an exaggeration.

While the chief attention of the explorers was devoted to the examination of the great buildings of Babylon, especially palaces and temples, it was their good fortune to discover a multitude of small objects, such as cuneiform tablets, statuettes and figurines, pottery, etc.

Thanks to these excavations we can now form a better picture than ever before of the city which so profoundly influenced the history of the world and so deeply impressed the imagination of ancient writers. But though much

has been done, much still remains to be done, not only in the depressions where the houses of the people lay, but also in the great mounds, not one of which has been fully explored.

Koldewey's book is entertainingly written, and is profusely illustrated with plans, sketches, and half-tone reproductions. Seven of the half-tones are reproduced in color, and give a fine impression of the brilliancy of the ancient decoration. The book is full of details, but is not overloaded with them. For the student of history or the Bible it is a work of the deepest interest and importance.

A word remains to be said about the translation. On the whole this is well done. In several instances errors of the original are corrected without comment, as "eastern" for "western" (p. xii, n. 36, and p. 214), "south-east" for "south-west" (p. 2, line 16), and "76" for "46" (p. 32, line 7). On the other hand "Nebuchadnezzar" for "Nabopolassar" (p. xvi, n. 144, and p. 232) seems to be a slip of the translator. The name is correctly given on p. 225, line 9. Inasmuch as Professor Güterbock of the Orient Society read the translation in proof, one suspects that some of the divergences from the German may be due to his hand. This would seem to be the case at least in the suppression of acknowledgment of indebtedness to him (p. vi of the German edition). In many cases the translation adds to or takes from the emphasis of the original, as "a number" (p. 6, line 4) for "many" (*viele*), and "many" (p. 164, line 18) for "several" (*mehrere*). Some of the translations are only approximations, as "strengthened our decision" (p. vi, line 10) for "helped to reach the decision" (*trugen mit zu dem Entschlusse bei*); "strip" (p. viii, line 4) for "corner" (*Ecke*); "only" (p. 3, line 12) for "scarcely" (*kaum*); "unfinished state" (p. 1, line 3) for "insignificance, small amount of" (*Geringfügigkeit*). Occasionally

the translation misrepresents the original, as p. 5, last sentence: "We shall later turn more in detail from the testimony of the ancient writers to the evidence of the ruins themselves." Read: "We shall later *return* more in detail *to* (the subject of) the relation of the ancient writers to the ruins themselves." On p. 5, line 15, for "There are other overwhelming considerations which we shall investigate later," read "Other considerations are decisive; we shall try to present them further along." On p. 5, line 16, for "even in circumference," read "already in circumference as we have now established it." On p. 5, line 19, for "which in other respects rivalled Babylon," read "which certainly approaches Babylon" (i.e., in size).

While these lists of infelicities of rendering might be much enlarged, not many cases have been noted in which the sense is seriously affected. Both translator and publisher have rendered valuable service in promptly making this important publication accessible in an English dress.

THE UNITY OF THE ARAMAIC ACTS

WILLIAM JEROME WILSON

SAN JOSE, CAL.

The most interesting contribution to New Testament criticism in recent times has come from a scholar in another field. Professor Torrey, a student of Semitics and particularly of the Aramaic, the language of the common people in Palestine before and after the Christian era, has propounded a new theory regarding the Book of Acts.¹ Chapters 1 1b — 15 35 are thought by him to have comprised an Aramaic book written about 49 or 50 A.D., which Luke later procured in Palestine and translated as faithfully as he was able, at the same time adding the remaining chapters himself in Greek on the basis of his own knowledge and investigation. The two parts of the book are accordingly designated I and II Acts, respectively. The evidence for the hypothesis is primarily linguistic. A striking series of Aramaisms and of mistranslations which can be plausibly corrected on the basis of the Aramaic, is found in I Acts, while in II Acts the reflections of Aramaic idiom are rare and instances of mistranslation are wholly lacking. The literature of the subject is not yet large, but a careful résumé and discussion of the new theory has appeared from the pen of Professor Foakes-Jackson.² Since he questions the validity of Professor Torrey's more important deductions — conclusions whose correctness had been accepted almost

¹ C. C. Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts*, Harvard Theological Studies, No. 1 (1917).

² In an article entitled "Professor C. C. Torrey on the Acts," *Harvard Theological Review*, October, 1917, pp. 352-361.

without qualification by the present writer³—a further consideration of their claims to credence may be permissible.

The epoch-making consequences of the theory Professor Foakes-Jackson sees clearly and states with generous frankness. To be sure, the term "orthodox" could be applied quite as appropriately to "our previous ideas of the date not only of Acts, but of the written synoptic tradition," as it can to the view newly promulgated, namely, "that Acts was completed by A.D. 64." But of course even these "previous ideas" have not been an *undisputed* orthodoxy, nor has the recent inclination to date Acts, and by implication most or all of the synoptics, after the year 70, always prevailed. There was an earlier stage of New Testament criticism which confidently placed these books in the second century. Later a dating between 75 and 85 became customary, and it is probably this which Professor Foakes-Jackson is somewhat loth to give up. But even before the Aramaic theory was promulgated, Professor Harnack, who formerly put Acts after 70 A.D., had come to the opinion that it was written before the Jewish war and soon after Paul's imprisonment. Professor Torrey's pronouncement in favor of a date as early as 64 A.D. seems thus but the culmination of a prevailing tendency in criticism to place this book progressively earlier in the Christian development. For New Testament criticism, we should do well to remember, furnishes almost as instructive a field for the tracing of historical tendency in the guise of successively asserted and rejected "orthodoxies" as does the collection of documents with which that criticism deals.

Professor Foakes-Jackson, while readily and gratefully accepting the demonstration of Aramaic sources for

³ In an article entitled "Some Observations on the Aramaic Acts," *Harvard Theological Review*, January, 1918, pp. 74-99. This was written before, though published after, the appearance of Professor Foakes-Jackson's treatment.

certain portions of Acts 1-15 35, is extremely doubtful that there was one continuous Aramaic document underlying these chapters. The question is one of prime importance. Naturally not every sentence or paragraph betrays the fact of translation by reflecting Aramaic idiom. Now Professor Foakes-Jackson shows an inclination to clear away all such indications from chapters 13-15, and more or less succeeds in doing so except for the sermon at Pisidian Antioch, "of which an Aramaic report may have been preserved," and the account of the Apostolic Council, "which may have been in Aramaic." These facts, he feels, militate against a belief in "the absolute unity of the Aramaic document."

It will be admitted that over against this theory of a patchwork of sources, some in Aramaic and some presumably in Greek, the original theory of Professor Torrey regarding I Acts has one great advantage, that of simplicity; and other things being equal, the simpler theory has the better claim to credence. The decision hinges ultimately on two main problems: (1) the degree of literary and artistic unity discoverable in the section 1-15 35, and (2) the psychological conceivability of such a process of slavishly literal and yet none too accurate translation as is here postulated on the part of Luke, the companion of Paul. In the circumstances these general questions may really be more important than that minute investigation "into questions of sources" which Professor Foakes-Jackson suggests as necessary "before conceding the homogeneity of the Aramaic document." No one will deny the necessity of studying minutiae in the search for sources, and yet the fact remains that detailed reconstructions are seldom convincing in their details. Only the larger facts of literary relationship and influence, such as can be deduced from the broad general indications of the material in question, can usually be recovered satisfactorily.

The point of view and purpose of the Aramaic document as a whole have been admirably stated by Professor Torrey himself,⁴ and yet it is possible that the argument for unity may be put a little more strongly even than he has made it. Assuming for purposes of investigation that his theory is correct, we seem to find running through the work two principal *motifs*: (1) the spiritual baptism with its accompanying glossolalia, and (2) the question of Gentile admissibility. In a previous discussion concerning the origin of the ascension narrative⁵ an attempt was made to indicate something of the significance of the baptism of the Holy Spirit in the second great stage of early Christianity. The Pentecostal outpouring is described in Acts with all the pomp and circumstance of which the Aramaic author is capable. The narrative

⁴ "A man of Judea, presumably of Jerusalem, undertook to set forth the main facts touching the growth of the Christian church from the little band of Jews left behind by Jesus to the large and rapidly growing body, chiefly Gentile, whose branches were in all parts of the world. He was a man of catholic spirit and excellent literary ability. He wrote in Aramaic, and with great loyalty to the Holy City and the Twelve Apostles, and yet at the same time with genuine enthusiasm for the mission to the Gentiles and its foremost representatives, especially Paul. His chief interest was in the universal mission of Christianity. He was secondarily interested to show —what the far-seeing among the Jewish Christians of his time must generally have acknowledged—that although the new faith was first developed, of necessity, among the Jews, yet being rejected by the main body of them it passed out of their hands. From the very beginning of his account, he had in mind as its central feature the wonderful transition from Jewish sect to world-religion. From the outset he purposed to show how Antioch became the first great Gentile centre of Christianity; his pride in Antioch was of course hardly equal to his pride in Jerusalem, but was very real nevertheless. It is a skilful arrangement of his material by which he makes it all lead up, in successive steps, to the first great triumphs of the new faith on foreign soil, and to the true climax in chapter 15."—Pp. 64 f.

"There is good reason to believe that in 15 35 we have the original conclusion of Luke's Aramaic source. This is the natural place for the Judean document to come to an end, for the story of the first distinct period of the Christian church in Jerusalem has been written. Peter has initiated the work among the Gentiles. Paul and Barnabas have gained their first great successes as foreign missionaries. The Mother Church has sent out its circular letter, voicing its own supreme authority and at the same time making Gentile Christianity permanently free from the regulations of Judaism. The verses 15 30–35 are admirably suited to bring the book to a close. The Gentiles, represented by the foremost Gentile Christian city, Antioch, receive their charter of freedom with joy; Judas and Silas return to Jerusalem; Paul and Barnabas remain in Antioch, 'teaching and preaching, with many others, the word of the Lord.'—P. 64.

⁵ In the Harvard Theological Review, January, 1918, pp. 77, 94–99.

of the ascension serves as a prelude to it. The choosing of Matthias is but another necessary preliminary, bringing the college of apostles up again to the full sacred number of twelve. Finally on the day of Pentecost, the anniversary according to the rabbis of the giving of the law, comes the miraculous gift of the Spirit with visible tongues of fire and the noise as of a mighty wind. The inspired utterances are intelligible to sojourners in Jerusalem from twelve representative regions of the known world,⁶ beginning beyond the eastern confines of the Roman empire and culminating in Rome itself, thus symbolizing at the very start the universal mission of the new religion. Peter is able at once to explain the true inward significance of the occurrence: it has been virtually the first act of the risen and exalted Jesus to claim from God, his Father, the previously promised Spirit and to pour it out on his disciples waiting below. "This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses. Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured it forth, as ye see and hear."⁷ In fact, Peter sees through the whole matter from the very start, taking no time apparently for reflection or to await developments. And he is ready with the practical application. At the close of his sermon he assures his hearers that if they repent and are baptized they also shall receive this same gift of the Holy Spirit.

All this is manifestly enough artificial, an imaginary reconstruction of an early period from the standpoint of a later one. The interesting aspect of the matter for the present purpose is this, that it is all so self-consistent on its own premises, so patently designed for a definite

⁶ Professor Harnack is surely right in suggesting the rejection of the references to "Judea" in verse 9 and to the "Cretans and Arabians" in verse 11, thus leaving an even twelve, again the sacred number.

⁷ Acts 2 32 f.

apologetical and homiletical purpose. Whatever earlier records he may have used — and an opinion has been expressed elsewhere regarding two cases which throw light on the problem of sources ⁸ — it is clear that this author has controlled his sources, and not been controlled by them; he has skilfully adapted his material to his own ends. For some reason or other he has conceived of the spiritual baptism as a thing of paramount importance in the Christian movement, and has set it forth with all possible prominence and emphasis in the forefront of his history.

At the other end of the document stands the famous Jerusalem Council, at which the question of Gentile admissibility was settled favorably to the party of progress. That it was a genuine triumph, and not a mere compromise, seems clear from the critical investigation of the text of the Apostolic Decree.⁹ If, as seems most probable, the three-clause text was the original,¹⁰ then the decision was wholly in favor of Paul and the liberal party, and the requirements still enjoined upon the Gentiles were not a mixture of the ceremonial and the moral, but simply an injunction to avoid the three deadly sins, idolatry, fornication, and murder. This interpretation alone makes the letter (Acts 15 23–29) in which the decree is embodied, self-consistent; for verse 24 very explicitly repudiates the doctrine of the self-appointed teachers from Judæa, who had tried to impose circumcision (verse 1), and by implication the whole Jewish law (cf. verse 5), upon the Antiochean Christians. Such explicit repudiation of the legalists hardly comports with a final decision which only established a compromise. The deliberate judgment of James

⁸ Harvard Theological Review, January, 1918, pp. 89 ff.

⁹ Acts 15 29.

¹⁰ See Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, pp. 48 ff., who rejects *πνικτῶν* as a gloss.

(verse 19) is expressed in terms which point in the same direction: "Wherefore my judgment is, that we trouble not those who from among the Gentiles turn to God." This sounds less like a compromise than a complete abandonment of the legalistic position with respect to Gentile Christians.

If such a view of the report of the Apostolic Council be correct, one of Professor Foakes-Jackson's objections to the Torreyan theory is greatly weakened, if not wholly met. He says: "Dr. Torrey points out . . . the impossibility of the Council of Jerusalem in Acts 15 having been so described by a companion of Paul's. But does not Dr. Torrey ignore the difficulty of accounting for a close friend of Paul's having incorporated into his narrative so damaging a statement as that relating to the proceedings of the Apostles and the promulgation of the letter to the churches of Syria and Cilicia?"¹¹ If, however, the result of the Council was a complete triumph, at least temporarily, for the Pauline party, the force of this objection is largely broken. Of course this is not the whole of the question. It ramifies interminably, involving ultimately such large problems as the date and destination of Galatians. Into these issues it is impossible to enter here. Suffice it to say that to a "South-Galatian" who is willing to date that epistle *before* the Apostolic Council, who identifies the "interview" of Galatians 2 with the "famine visit" of Acts 11 30 and 12 25, and who accepts the three-clause text of the Apostolic Decree, there are no very serious difficulties in the way of supposing either that a companion of Paul wrote the fifteenth chapter of Acts or that such a person incorporated it into his book—always remembering that a friend and com-

¹¹ P. 358. However, if I read aright, Professor Torrey at the beginning of his second chapter is not so much giving his own judgment on the varying Christology and style of the different parts of Acts and the incompatibility of Acts 15 with Galatians 2, as simply reviewing the reasons, cogent and otherwise, which have led to the so prevalent opinion that II Acts is composite.

panion of Paul need by no means have been Paul's mere echo.¹²

The report of the Apostolic Council, which ended in a sweeping triumph for the liberal view, is the climax of the Aramaic book. It was, to be sure, a temporary triumph, as such victories are rather wont to be. The opposition was momentarily crushed, overwhelmed by the authority of Peter and the mass of evidence presented by Barnabas and Paul; but as we well know, it was by no means completely destroyed. Now our Aramaic author was not a trained historian, capable of foreseeing that opposition thus crushed would inevitably break out again in other and perhaps violent forms. Rather he was persuaded that a solid and lasting victory had been won for those principles of universalism and anti-legalism in which he so earnestly believed. And in the first flush of his enthusiasm — presumably before the opposition had assumed its later and more sinister forms — he wrote his book as a celebration and justification of the splendid triumph. The air of fresh enthusiasm which pervades

¹² A note may be intruded at this point regarding another objection raised by Professor Foakes-Jackson in the same paragraph (p. 359)—“the problem of reconciling Acts 28 17 ad fin. with all that is elsewhere known of Paul's attitude toward the Jewish leaders. How could a disciple of Paul who knew of the Epistle to the Romans, make the Jewish elders of Rome ignorant not only of his existence but of that of the Christian sect?” There is a certain exegesis of the passage, however, which relieves it of these supposed implications. In 28 17-20 Paul is apparently anxious lest his Jewish accusers at Jerusalem should already have sent to the Jews at Rome a prejudicial statement regarding his character and past conduct. He is anxious to anticipate such a report if it has not already come, or to meet and answer it if it has. But the Jewish leaders assure him (verse 21) that no such report has come either by letter or by messenger, and they express their desire to hear his teachings; “for as concerning this sect, it is known to us that everywhere it is spoken against” (verse 22). Does this indeed imply ignorance of the existence of the Christian sect, or quite the reverse? Does it not in the plainest possible terms imply considerable hearsay knowledge concerning the sect, mostly of a prejudicial character; and does not their desire to hear Paul's doctrines even suggest that perhaps they knew of him already by reputation as a leader in the new movement and so able to give them authoritative information? At any rate verse 21 need not mean at all that they had never heard of Paul, but only that no adverse report concerning him had preceded him from Judea: “We neither received letters from Judea concerning thee, nor did any of the brethren come hither and report or speak any harm of thee.” In any case, Paul's tactful and earnest effort to conciliate the Roman Jews and win their confidence, before turning to the Gentiles, seems quite in accord with his usual custom elsewhere.

the book suggests that it was written soon after the Council of 49 A.D., and is if anything a stronger consideration than the argument based on the references to Silas in Acts 15 33 and 40.¹³ The two considerations reinforce each other; but the matter of the movements of Silas impressed me at first, before I had caught the spirit of the book as a whole and could judge of its tendencies, as a rather slender argument for the date assigned.

These then are the two *motifs* of the Aramaic book. The Pentecostal narrative stands as an imposing prelude, recounting the original gift of the Holy Spirit. The Apostolic Council stands as a dramatic finale, irrevocably committing Christianity to its universal mission. Nor are these two leading ideas confined to the beginning and the end, respectively. On the contrary, they dominate the whole work. The doctrine of spiritual baptism, so impressively illustrated on Pentecost, recurs at frequent intervals thereafter, notably in Acts 4 31 (which is in its outward manifestation almost a second Pentecost), 5 32 (almost a second Pentecostal sermon), 8 15 ff. (Simon tries to purchase the gift), 9 17 (the Spirit promised to Paul), 10 38 (God anointed *Jesus* with the Holy Spirit and with power), 10 44 ff. (the case of Cornelius; cf. 11 4-18), 15 8 (Peter's speech at the Council). Likewise the other great theme of the book, the universal destiny of Christianity, is indicated in a long series of premonitions, notably 1 8 ("witnesses . . . unto the uttermost part of the earth"), 2 9 f. (the geographical list of sojourners), 2 39 ("the promise . . . to all that are afar off"), 3 25 ("In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed"), 6 14 (Stephen accused of predicting the abolition of the law), 8 4 ff. (Samaria receives the

¹³ So Torrey, p. 68, who finds it very significant that the Aramaic author "did not know that Silas had started on a new missionary journey in company with Paul. A man of his interests and information could not have remained for many months in ignorance of this most important turn of events." Hence a date late in the year 49, or early in the year 50.

word), 10 9-16, 28, 34 (the vision of Peter and his visit to Cornelius), 11 18 ("Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance"), 11 20 (missionary work among the Greeks), 13 39, 46 ("Lo, we turn to the Gentiles"), 14 27 ("opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles"), before the final acceptance of the principle in chapter 15. Moreover — and this is the highly significant feature — the two ideas which thus run through the whole book are causally interconnected in the author's mind. The glossolalia is decked out in its festal Pentecostal garb and accorded such peculiar prominence, precisely because of its bearing on the Gentile controversy. At the Apostolic Council it is Peter's testimony that turns the scale (cf. Acts 15 14), and Peter's argument is based solidly on his experience in this matter of the Spirit. He feels sure that God from ancient times intended to admit the Gentiles to salvation, and the experimental proof is this, that under Peter's preaching the Gentiles had received the Holy Spirit, glossolalia and all, exactly as had the Jews. That had been the line of Peter's defence against the criticisms of his Jerusalem compatriots at an earlier time: that the Spirit made no racial distinctions (Acts 11 12). This had forced his critics to the logically inevitable conclusion, "Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life" (verse 18). The test case had been that of Cornelius and his household, who had actually received the Holy Spirit and spoken with tongues before being so much as baptized (Acts 10 44-48). The importance of that case was fully recognized. There is no reason to doubt the essential fact, but it is dressed up with an elaboration of visions and legends — and incidentally of repetitions — which is paralleled only in the Pentecostal narrative and in that other incident of profound importance to the liberal cause, namely, the conversion of Paul. The fact that these three earlier points of critical significance in the history — Pentecost, Paul's con-

version, and the case of Cornelius — are so thickly encrusted with legend, while the story of the Apostolic Council is so straightforward and matter-of-fact, furnishes another reason for dating the Aramaic book soon after the last-named event. The Aramaic author may well have been present. At any rate, there had not been time for legendary accretions to gather.

The literary and artistic unity of the Aramaic document is thus seen to be very great. It is a closely knit work showing the characteristic contour which we have been trained to expect in the best products of the dramatic art. Its two leading *motifs*, brought into special prominence, the one at the beginning and the other at the end of the narrative, are found on close scrutiny to run through the whole and to be conjoined logically and causally at the point of climactic interest just a little beyond the middle. So far as this problem is concerned, the case stands well with the theory of a unified document.

The other problem is more difficult, though the answer, such as it is, can be given in briefer space. Is it conceivable that Luke, or any other person, should have taken a document of this sort and translated it literally word for word, not intentionally altering it at a single point, and should then have gone on to complete the narrative and indirectly to correct some of the misstatements when occasion presented? The supposition is not an easy one, and yet who shall set logical limits to the things of which the human mind is capable? Certainly no modern scholar would treat a document in such a peculiar way; and yet that is no reason why Luke, an enthusiastic early Christian, a believer in miracles and all the rest, should not have done so. Perhaps there are even certain reasons why he should have done precisely this thing. In the first place, recall the artistic unity of the document with which he was dealing, and imagine what a powerful

and fascinating effect it must have had upon his mind, he being himself a member of the liberal party. In comparison with the brilliance of its great main thesis any minor errors of detail must have seemed trivial in the extreme, and to have stopped here and there to make corrections in so truly inspired a work would have bordered on sacrilege. I doubt if it was necessary to hesitate at the word "sacred" ¹⁴ as a description of Luke's feeling for so powerful and edifying a book.

Another aspect of the psychological objection is brought up by Professor Foakes-Jackson in the following words: "That Luke translated this [document] with meticulous accuracy, adding nothing of importance of his own and adapting nothing to prove those points which he desired to establish, is, judging by his use of Mark and Q, to me at least incredible." ¹⁵ At first sight this point seems weighty. In both cases Luke had before him a completed document to serve as his fundamental basis: Mark for his gospel and the Aramaic book for Acts. Unquestionably he used Mark as the framework for his first composition, omitting useless or undesirable portions, occasionally rearranging the order, and interlarding the work plentifully with material from other sources — probably from several others. Then why not also in Acts? And yet after all the two cases are hardly similar. For one thing, Mark was no such skilfully constructed piece of writing as was the Aramaic history. Also, the rich "logian" material now in Luke's Gospel had to be inserted somewhere *inside of the Markan framework* if it was to be included at all; whereas the material which Luke had to contribute to the book of Acts belonged almost exclusively to the period *after the Apostolic Council*. Hence the temptation to disturb the closely woven

¹⁴ So Foakes-Jackson, p. 352: "To Luke it was so important — I had almost said so sacred — that he did not presume to alter a word when he made his literal translation."

¹⁵ Ibid. p. 360.

texture of the Aramaic history was minimized. There was another factor working in the same direction. The Gospel of Mark, when employed by Luke, had required a good deal in the way of adaptation, for it was a record from a much earlier time and contained many things ill-suited to this later age. But in the case of the Aramaic document this work of adaptation had already been done. It was much nearer to Luke in point of time, and he was apparently in full accord with its fundamental "tendencies." In this case, therefore, no changes "to prove those points which he desired to establish" would appear to have been necessary. Thus there remain only certain minor errors of detail that would naturally seem to Luke to call for correction. Some such corrections he made quietly at appropriate points in his own section of the work; for example, the matter of the movements of Silas, and the facts regarding the conversion of Paul. Some other errors, such as the reference to the "forty days," he neglected altogether. To have altered that passage in order to bring it into harmony with the close of his own Gospel would have impaired the symbolism of the entire opening section of Acts, and Luke's scientific impulses were surely not strong enough for such heroic measures as that. The living unity of the document itself — plus the never-to-be-forgotten factor of human inertia — sufficed to protect it at that point.

When all is said and done, the fact remains that the psychology of Luke as translator and author, respectively, of the two parts of Acts is somewhat difficult; but the difficulties are nowhere nearly so great as on the older supposition that the author of the Third Gospel had in Acts composed freely a second work and adapted its sources to suit his own theories. On that supposition the "forty days," the conversion narratives, and the statements about Silas were absolutely insoluble puzzles.

And to seek escape from these troubles by denying the identity of authorship of Luke and Acts was to fly in the face of all the evidence, both external and stylistic, bearing on that problem. Thus, while the psychology of Luke is still a thing to be explained and accounted for, the case on the whole is very much improved. On the other hand, the literary unity of the rediscovered Aramaic document seems unmistakable and waiting only to be recognized and appreciated. When to the great mass of linguistic evidence are added this literary evidence and a greatly simplified psychology, the argument for the new theory of Acts appears very strong indeed.

BOOK REVIEWS

MENNO SIMONS; HIS LIFE, LABORS, AND TEACHINGS. JOHN HORSCH. The Mennonite Publishing House. Scottdale, Pa. 1916. Pp. 324.

GLEANINGS FROM OLD SHAKER JOURNALS. CLARA E. SEARS. The Houghton Mifflin Co. 1916. Pp. xiv, 298. \$1.25.

To render original sources accessible is to confer an obligation not only upon scholars but upon all intelligent readers. Such a service, in widely different fields, the authors of these two books claim to have rendered. Mr. Horsch says in his Preface: "Menno Simons is perhaps today the most neglected of the prominent leaders in the history of the Christian Church. Neither in the English nor the German language is a book on his life and teachings available." This is perhaps overstating the fact. For his writings are published in English and in German by the Mennonite Publishing Co. at Elkhart, Ind.; and on the supposed tercentenary in 1861 of Simons's death, *Gedankenblätter*, a selection in German from his writings, was published at Dantzic under the editorship of J. Mannhardt. Among the books in Dutch is *Menno Simons, eene Levensschetzel* (1892); and on one important department of the subject is Daniel J. Cassel's *History of the Mennonites from the Time of their Emigration to America* (1888).

Menno Simons was born, probably in 1496, in Friesland. His second name signifies merely that he was the son of Simon, and his followers therefore properly take their designation from his Christian name. For twelve years he was a priest of the Church; but on hearing of the execution in 1530 of Sikke Frerichs for having been baptized when an adult, he came to the conclusion from studying the Scriptures that there was no ground in them for infant baptism. Here, as so often, a martyr was a good advertisement. Menno had before this been interested in Luther's books, and now strode on beyond Luther. "Neither Luther nor Zwingli questioned the validity of Roman Catholic sacraments and ordination. If infant baptism was unscriptural and invalid, the Lutheran and Zwinglian reformation was clearly inadequate. . . . A regeneration or renewing of the Church along New Testament lines was in order. The restoration of scriptural baptism was in fact the most funda-

mental requirement for a true New Testament Church" (Horsch, p. 23). Adult baptism emphasized individualism, and carried with it therefore the independence of each congregation of believers and a sharp separation from the unbaptized, the great majority, of "the world." To many of the world's favorite customs the Mennonites were opposed — to oaths trivial or legal, to war, and they were the first to protest against slavery. They opposed a State Church, and therefore hated both the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran Churches. Basing themselves upon the Scriptures, they practised foot-washing; while in the seventeenth century a body of them in Switzerland came to the conclusion that the use of buttons and of the razor might imperil salvation. They took pains to prevent themselves from being confused with John of Leyden's Münsterites, but by the indiscriminating they were identified with them and were slaughtered accordingly. In the latter part of the sixteenth century they touched England through Amsterdam, where Thomas Helwys joined them with his congregation of Brownists; though afterwards he and his friends left them and called themselves Baptists. The separation in the modern world of Church and State, the assertion of the liberty of conscience and of the continuity of revelation, are mainly due not to orthodox Protestantism but to the heretical sects, of which the Anabaptists, including the Mennonites, were the chief.¹ In 1683 the Mennonites bought 8,000 acres of land from William Penn, and founded Germantown. Their chief home is now in the United States, where they report 80,000 members out of a world-membership of 250,000. Their original tenets in regard to discipline, bearing arms, and civil office are now abolished. In addition to an interesting historical sketch of Menno, Mr. Horsch gives 76 pages of extracts from his works illustrative of his system of doctrine, a complete list of his published works and letters, and a dozen pages of bibliography.

Miss Sears claims, not like Mr. Horsch priority in presentation of subject, but originality of matter. "Hesitatingly at first but with increasing confidence, I was permitted to pore over cherished records of the past and worn-out journals and touching books of verses. These are kept in hidden cupboards where the curious cannot find them" (p. xii). Her book gives a history of the Shaker Movement based on hitherto unpublished records of the Shakers in Harvard, Mass., and contains valuable extracts from those records.

The Shakers, whose name for themselves is "The United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Appearing," originated in France at

¹ Cf. Troeltsch's *Protestantism and Progress*; tr. by W. Montgomery, pp. 104, 122.

the close of the seventeenth century, when Jean Cavalier established the society known as the Camisards. They proclaimed the near approach of God's kingdom on earth and the necessity therefore of repentance and amendment. The contemplation of these mighty subjects produced in them tremblings, faintings, paroxysms, clairvoyance, prophesying, gifts of tongues, healing — all the manifestations which have always attended absorption in the Divine. Established religion treated these claimants to direct inspiration as was the custom, and as it had treated the Mennonites: it proceeded to send them to the stake and the wheel. Then Cavalier escaped to England, where by 1705 he had three or four hundred "prophets" stirring the country with the warning that the acceptable year of the Lord was at hand. Lack of organization, however, retarded the Movement, till it was taken up by two Quakers, James Wardley and his wife, who in 1747 founded in Manchester a Society of 30 persons. These agreed in the conviction that the Christ-spirit "would again appear on this earth, but this time it would be in the personality of a woman. Their argument was that God, being eternal spirit, must combine in Himself all the positive or masculine qualities of Power, Justice, Truth, Knowledge, and Might, and the negative or feminine qualities of Mercy, Loving-kindness, and Forgiveness as well, and that as He had revealed His Spirit through Man, so He must also reveal it through Woman, in order to complete the full revelation of His Divine Nature. With this expectation firmly established, they eagerly awaited its fulfilment; and they believed they found the fulfilment complete in the person of Ann Lee, who united herself to the Society in 1758" (p. 8).

After experiencing the usual persecutions, they migrated to America in 1774 and established themselves at Watervliet near Albany, N.Y. They combined religious fervor and "manifestations" with excellence in farming, and these qualities aroused both hostility and admiring adhesion. After half a dozen years they felt a missionary call toward New England, for Mother Ann had seen in England a vision of faces in the east turned to her in expectation. So a delegation set out to locate the promised land, and finally fixed it in Harvard, Mass. Here, from 1781 to the death of Mother Ann in 1784, was the classic period of Shakerism. They rejected marriage, baptism, and the Lord's Supper. They practised a strict discipline, renunciation of "the world," manual work for all, communism of property, government by appointed Elders. Their worship consisted in marching and singing, which developed into jumping, dancing, whirling, falling prostrate, speaking with

"tongues." "Others," said an intelligent visitor from "the world," "will be shooin and hissing evil spirits out of the house; all in different tunes, groaning, jumping, laughing, talking and stuttering, shooin, and hissing, that makes a perfect bedlam" (p. 60). These exercises were not confined to their meeting-house. "At dawn, at midday, in the twilight, at the moon-rise, a traveller on the country roads around Harvard would see women and men, sometimes in groups according to sex, sometimes a single figure, whirling past him, dancing with rhythmic shaking of heads, arms, and hands. Fear and superstition gripped the hearts of the beholders, and they were wont to flee precipitately" (p. 61). It was the importation into modern Protestantism of the methods of Oriental dervishes. Before auto-suggestion, hypnotism, thought- and power-transference were understood, those who possessed these abilities considered them as proofs that they were directly inspired by God, and others either believed with reverence or regarded these manifestations as of the devil. Hard-headed New England took, in the main, the latter view, and, as the stake and the wheel had become illegal, had to content itself with arrests, mobs, whippings, and banishment.

Mother Ann Lee had, like Mrs. Eddy, ruled her Church with a strong hand. After her death Elder James Whitaker kept the Society together for three years, when Elder Joseph Meacham, upon whom Mother Ann had entailed the succession, became its head. He and Eldress Lucy Wright gathered the Church again in Harvard in 1791. In this, its second period, its organization became closer and its peculiar characteristics were modified. A shuffling march became its usual ritual, though the older members could not restrain themselves at times from leaping and dancing. The hostility against the Shakers diminished as their extravagances declined and their farm-produce increased. The genuineness of their piety and the excellence of their apple-sauce came to be recognized and brought them kindly toleration. But celibacy, which prevented growth from within, the tendency in the world away from "herb-doctoring" towards a more scientific medical theory, the development of farming on a large scale by machinery, the growth of millenarian views elsewhere, all combined to steer the Society into a back-water, and modern life passed it by, leaving still about a thousand Shakers in small settlements now scattered through the United States.

In studying the Shaker Movement one is impressed, as in the case of so many of the smaller religious sects, with the poverty of intellectual outlook from which it sprang. Yet it must be remembered that when it arose, Biblical Criticism had not begun to replace the

theory of verbal inspiration with the idea of progressive revelation. In treating the words of the Bible as literal, infallible, and ultimate, the Shakers did only what almost all the other Christians of their time were doing. But what they drew from their study of the Bible — the characteristic tenet of the nearness of Christ's Second Advent — was taken up in the first third of the nineteenth century by the more energetic hands of William Miller; and among the 50,000 who in 1843 stood in their white robes ready to ascend at the Lord's appearing, there were doubtless many who, if they had lived a generation earlier, would have been attracted by Shakerism.

Among the valuable features of Miss Sears's book are the vivid descriptions of the mobs which attacked the Shakers, the music and words of many of the Shaker hymns, together with ample data of the farm-produce and especially of the herb-department. For a fuller view of what the Shakers say of themselves, the book needs to be supplemented by such works as *Testimonies to the Precepts of Mother Ann Lee, Collected from Living Witnesses; Shakerism, its Meaning and Message*, by Anna White and Leila S. Taylor; and especially *Shaker Sermons, Containing the Substance of Shaker Theology*, by Bishop Henry L. Eads.

FREDERIC PALMER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

LUTHER AND LUTHERDOM. From Original Sources by Heinrich Denifle. Translated from the Second Revised Edition of the German by RAYMUND VOLZ. Vol. I, Part 1. Torch Press. Somerset, Ohio. 1917. Pp. lii, 465.

To call, with Gooch, "Denifle's eight hundred pages hurled at the memory of the Reformer among the most repulsive books in historical literature," is not a bit too strong. That the author's feelings were so immensely enlisted would not matter if the man only had a spark of the candor and real desire to be fair that distinguishes the work of scholars like Pastor and Acton. But Denifle's mind was so warped by hatred that, while preternaturally sharp-sighted in detecting the slightest faults of Luther or the most trivial errors of modern Protestant scholars, he was, to the larger aspects of his subject, portentously blind. *Luther and Lutherdom* is a learned and elaborate libel.

Let us take a single example of its famous "method." The Dominican asserts that Luther set aside all prohibitions of consanguineous marriages, even that of parent and child and of brother and sister (p. 324). Any other scholar, in making so startling a charge, would

examine the evidence carefully. In proportion to the vast improbability that the Reformer should here have gone counter not only to all Christian sentiment but to that of the whole world, savage as well as civilized, the historian should have demanded copious proof and have sifted it judicially. One would expect that in a point like this a great stir would have been made and much would be forthcoming. But Denifle bases his assertion on *a single word*. When Spalatin drew up a table of forbidden degrees for the use of the Saxon Visitors, he wrote: "Bruder und Schwester mugen sich nicht verehelichen; so mag einer auch seines Bruders oder Schwester Tochter oder Enkel nicht nehmen." In revising the list Luther wrote opposite this section "Todt," which Denifle interprets to mean that he repealed the whole law (Enders: *Luthers Briefwechsel*, vi, 186). The intrinsic improbability of this interpretation is so enormous, unsupported as it is by a single other passage in all the Reformer's voluminous works, that, even if the document in question stood alone, the careful searcher for truth would be forced to conclude that, whatever "todt" meant, it could not mean this. But the document does not stand alone. With it Luther sent a letter (De Wette: *Luthers Briefe*, iii, 260), in which the real meaning of the word is clearly shown to be merely "strike out," and the reason is distinctly given, namely that it is better on such points to allow the Visitors to give oral instruction when necessary. In the same letter and paragraph Luther discusses the marriage of uncle and niece, which on Biblical precedent he allows, but he says not one word on the marriage of kinsmen in the first and second degrees, proof positive that he never even so much as contemplated the possibility of it.

Of course Denifle's work is not all as worthless as this. His wide reading in scholastic and patristic literature served to elucidate some of Luther's ideas and to point out the failings of his recent editors and biographers. But though the scholar can still learn something from this work, yet its value has greatly decreased since it was first published fourteen years ago. Luther's commentary on Romans, known to Denifle in manuscript, has since been published in model form, and the researches of Scheel and Ficker and A. V. Müller and Grisar and many other scholars have left the learned Dominican far in the rear.

The worst that can usually be said of the present translation is that it is extremely inelegant, and the proof poorly read ("Eues" for "Cues," p. xlvii, "Raumburg" for "Naumburg," p. 143). The inelegance is due in part to the desire to be literal, as when Volz

renders, "Aurifaber omitted this passage, likely as smutty" (p. 105). In some cases, however, the sense of the original is totally missed. Where Denifle wrote: "Man müsse meinem Werke gegenüber den Standpunkt Niedriger hängen, einnehmen: Luther und der Protestantismus werde durch dasselbe nicht berührt," Volz translates: "My work is to be offset by the viewpoint of Niedriger — assume that Luther and Protestantism are not touched by it" (p. viii). "Niedriger," of course, is not a proper name, but a common noun meaning "obscure people."

PRESERVED SMITH.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y.

CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN WITH JOHN KEBLE AND OTHERS. 1839-45. Edited at the Birmingham Oratory. Longmans, Green, & Co. 1917. Pp. x, 413. \$4.00.

Those, and they are many, for whom the name of Newman is still one to conjure with, will notice with surprise the meticulous caution with which the censorship of the Church has been brought to bear upon these Letters. The author was the greatest Catholic divine in a century of reaction. He did not suffer fools, even in high places, gladly; but his differences with the Rome of Pius IX were with its temper and methods, not with its teaching. Folly, carried beyond a certain point, became, he thought, a moral fault. Acton, who read him more accurately than any of his contemporaries, and from the wider European rather than from the provincial English standpoint, makes no question of his Ultramontanism; on which his elevation to the Cardinalate by Leo XIII, one of the most Roman, though one of the wisest, of Pontiffs, set the final seal. Yet the permission of three several Censors, one of them an Archbishop, is required before this selection from his letters between 1839 and 1845 can be published. And the censorship, it should be remembered, is negative, not positive; that is, it does not express approval. What it says is "Nihil Obstat"; there is no sufficient reason to refuse permission for the book to be printed. Such precaution does not inspire confidence. We do not know how far we have the real Newman; all that we can be sure of is that we have Newman as the ecclesiastical authorities wish him to appear. It is possible that in the letters of the years covered by the present collection there is little to which they could take exception. But there are periods in his life of which this could certainly not be said. His papers and correspondence, for example, between 1860 and 1876 would be of

the greatest possible interest to the historian of the Church of the nineteenth century. But unless, by some happy indiscretion, these documents are published without being submitted to the censor, the chances of their appearance are small.

Whether or no the result is due to the care with which they have been selected, edited, and censored, the letters contained in this substantial volume are — what is rarely the case with Newman's writings — frankly dull. They describe a succession of small storms in a small tea-cup: Tract XC; the Jerusalem bishopric; the varying fortunes of the Oxford Movement; all treated from a narrow sectarian point of view and with a curious want of urbanity and temper. Dr. Arnold of Rugby was the *bête noir* of the party — the question, "But is *he* a Christian?" will be remembered (*Apologia*, Chap. I); and on his death we find the following comment in a letter to Keble in the present collection:

"If it is right to speculate on such serious matters, there is something quite of comfort to be gathered from his removal from this scene of action, at the time it took place; as if so good a man should not be suffered to commit himself *cominus* against truths which he so little understood" (p. 321).

On the appointment of Dr. Alexander to the bishopric of Jerusalem he writes to J. R. Hope:

"Your account of the Jerusalem matter is fearful; the more I think of it the more I am dismayed. . . . I feel so strongly about it that when once I begin to publish my 'Protest', I think I shall introduce it as a preface or appendix to every book and every edition of a book I print. If people are driving me, quite against all my feelings, out of the Church of England, they shall know that they are doing so. Is there no means of impeaching or indicting someone or other? Lawyers can throw anything into form. Should Bishop Alexander commit any irregularity out in Palestine, might not one bring him into Court in England?" (p. 144).

And Hope addresses Gladstone on the same subject:

"Had Prussia come to us humbled and penitent, complaining that separation from the Catholic Church was too heavy any longer to be borne . . . then none more gladly than I would have prayed that, as far as higher duties would allow, she should become one with us. But as it is, she comes jauntily, by a Royal Envoy, with a Royal Liturgy in her hand, and a new and comprehensive theory of religion on her lips, to propose joint endowment of Bishoprics, alternate nominations, mixed confessions of faith . . . and a Political Protectorate soldered together by a divine institution. . . . And, alas that it should be so! she has found among our Bishops men ready to grant, without a pause or a doubt, all that she desired" (p. 158).

What a view! What a world! What a mentality! Can we wonder at Bunsen's judgment of the Movement — that it was "Popery without authority, Protestantism without liberty, Catholicism without universality, and Evangelism without spirituality"? or at Arnold's verdict on its action, for example, in the Hampden controversy?—"There was in that something more than theoretical opinion; there was downright evil acting; and the more I consider it, the more my sense of its evil grows" (*Life of Arnold*, p. 424).

To the present generation Newman is an enigma. That he was the leader of a reaction is certain. Catholicism owes him much. He restored its poetry; like the pious sons of Noah, he "went backward," and threw a veil over its shame. But in his later years *Lucanus an Apulus, anceps*. There were those to whom he seemed to have a foot in each camp. He was supposed to have an answer to every doubt and a solution for every difficulty. "If John Henry Newman can be a Catholic, surely you can," is an *argumentum ad hominem* by which many a waverer has been silenced; if belief can be vicarious, it could be so (it was thought) here. But if he possessed the powers attributed to him, he kept them *in scrinio pectoris*. His reserve was impenetrable; they did not appear. Jowett's comment on the *Apologia* was (1) that it was "not the work of a saint"—the great man was intolerant of opposition; and (2) that it discussed at great length the question whether the writer should, or should not, become a Roman Catholic — "not, I think, a matter of any great importance," the Master added. The remark showed less than his usual perspicacity; for both to the Catholic Church and to the Church of England Newman's secession was an event of the first consequence. It set the former in a false perspective; for he was a great magician—his spells could make shadows real and the worse the better reason; and it hypnotized the latter into the disastrous policy of substituting the denominational for the national idea. "Anglicanism," as the word is now understood, is the creation of the Oxford Movement; and it looks "to the hole of the pit whence it was digged."

The period of these Letters is that in which Newman was accusing himself to the idea of secession. He was a master of introspection and self-portraiture; the process of auto-suggestion is vividly described. But the interest of the book is historical, not actual; the climate has changed. People still become Roman Catholics from a variety of motives — political, æsthetic, temperamental; and two generations ago more serious reasons led more serious persons to take that step. But surely no one ever took it, then or now, on such

grounds as those given by Newman; that is, on the strength of a supposed analogy between the relation of the Church of England to modern Catholicism and that of the Monophysites of the fourth century to Rome; Luther corresponding to Eutyches, the English bishop to Flavian, and Leo the Great, the most imperial of Roman Pontiffs, to the fatuous Gregory XVI. The unreality of the outlook is absolute. However great their negative sincerity, the position of those who take it is fantastic and unreal. These extravagances of the Tract party have left their mark more deeply than superficial observers think upon the Church of England. Their results are seen in its thinning congregations, its declining observance, its increasing failure to keep in touch with the national mind and life. When religion takes them into a backwater, people pass it by.

Newman was "stiff in opinion." Anglicanism he despised, Protestantism he detested, Liberalism he hated and feared. His ideal Church was that of the Fathers of the fourth century. "Be, my soul, with the Saints! and shall I lift up my hand against them?" "The much-enduring Athanasius and the majestic Leo," these were his heroes. "Anathema to a whole tribe of Cranmers, Riddleys, Latimers, and Jewels! perish the names of Bramhall, Ussher, Taylor, Stillingfleet, and Barrow, from the face of the earth, ere I should do aught but fall at their feet in love and worship, whose image was continually before my eyes, and whose musical words were ever in my ear and on my tongue!" His difficulties in later life came to a great extent from a certain *esprit frondeur*; he did not work easily with, or under, other men. But he saw no Catholicism outside Rome; and he was too thoroughly drawn to Catholicism, both by temperament and from dread of the scepticism which, for him, was the alternative, to hesitate. Acutely as he suffered under the deplorable Pontificate of Pius IX and at the hands of his odious *entourage*, it is impossible to think that his regrets were more than velleities; or that, whatever he may have said or written under extreme nervous tension, he ever seriously contemplated retracing his steps. Nor can we wish that he had done so. If the Roman furrow was not his, the English was still less so; like another eminent and ambiguous personality of our generation (Lord Rosebery) he must plough his own. Such figures are the disappointment of their own, and an enigma to later, time. They are full of promise, well equipped, brilliant, the favorites of fortune. "Ye did run well; who did hinder you?" Yet the dull, the vulgar, the mean, outstrip them. These have, it seems, a robustness of fibre in which those are lacking; and now, as of old, the sorrowful but inexorable sentence is passed upon

the children of the kingdom, "the publicans and the harlots"—a lesser breed, a lower race—"go into the kingdom of God before you."

ALFRED FAWKES.

RUGBY, ENGLAND.

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN. FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY. The Macmillan Co. 1917. Pp. xii, 214. \$1.25.

Professor Peabody sets out with asking some questions which have at present more than usual importance: "What are the special obstacles which American civilization offers to religious progress? What are the traits of the American character on which teachers of religion may most confidently depend?" The Papers which constitute the book, "occasional for the most part in their origin and fragmentary in their form," are offered not as an answer to these and kindred questions, but as "exploratory excursions" into the field. This modest description is more than justified. The book has more unity than is here claimed. It is permeated throughout by Professor Peabody's experienced insight, sound judgment, clearness and grace of style, and his loving appreciation of the person and work of Jesus Christ. An illuminative instance of this is his treatment of the interview of Jesus with the Roman centurion (p. 112), and of the light it casts on the nature and worth of discipline, so much needed in American life. His analysis of the American character is discriminating and just (p. 93 f.); especially in his insistence on two foci for it—commercialism and idealism—rather than either of these as a centre, as many superficial observers have reported.

The book accomplishes its aim. It is not a treatise on Americanism, education, or religion; but it flashes interpretative light on all three, and adds another to the valuable series in which Professor Peabody has shown the union of piety and intelligence.

FREDERIC PALMER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

STUDIES IN THE PROBLEM OF SOVEREIGNTY. HAROLD J. LASKI. Yale University Press. 1917. Pp. 297. \$2.50.

Mr. Laski's book will, we venture to predict, command two classes of readers; for it is a contribution not only to political thought but also to the history of events of wide interest. Written with the object of discussing the theory of the State, it contains really valuable

description of the Disruption in Scotland, of the Oxford Movement, and of the establishment of the Roman hierarchy in England. For the author, following in the steps of the late Professor Maitland and his disciple, Dr. Figgis, whose theological outlook differs widely from his master's, recognizes that the Christian Church was one of the greatest nurseries of political theory. The modern conception of the State is, in fact, the outcome of the mediæval idea of the Church. And more than this, the problems of the State have in our own time been first brought into the light of day in the form of ecclesiastical questions imperatively demanding solution. The principles maintained so strenuously by Guelf and Ghibelline in Italy respectively, the dreams of Dante, the views of Marsilius of Padua, cast their shadows on modern history; and the voices of Gregory VII and Boniface VIII find their echoes not only in the Church but in the State of today.

Perhaps it is to be regretted that Mr. Laski has reprinted a lecture he delivered as an introduction to his thesis. It has all the merits and the faults of its original purpose. That is to say, it was evidently a most interesting lecture, and for this very reason has a certain lack of the literary style which adorns the rest of the volume. If, therefore, the reader should hastily judge by the opening remarks that the book is not likely to interest him and is disposed to lay it aside, he will be a serious loser, as there is hardly a page which will not repay careful perusal.

The chapter on the Sovereignty of the State is, however, in our judgment the least satisfactory, because it deals rather with abstractions than realities. With Mr. Laski's general contention we cordially agree, that a dangerous fallacy is contained in the dictum, "Everywhere the One comes before the Many. All Manyness has its origin in the Oneness and to Oneness it returns. Therefore all order consists in the subordination of Plurality to Unity." At the same time there are occasions when the State has the right imperatively to demand a unity which it has no time to secure by persuasion. Undoubtedly, when the individual is able to say, "I shall fight for England because I genuinely accept the rightness of its cause, not because when the call comes I must unheedingly, and, therefore unintelligently, obey it," "the State," again to quote Mr. Laski's words, "will be stronger which binds its members by the strength of a moral purpose validated" — whatever may be the exact meaning of the last words.

But such a state is no more than an abstraction; whereas the countries to which all of us belong are actualities, and when their very

existence is threatened, whether they are republics like the United States, or constitutional or centralized monarchies like England or Germany, the State has not time to exercise a reasonable persuasion but must call upon every individual to act, and if, when so called on, he wishes to pause and examine the rights and wrongs of the case before he obeys, he does so at his own personal risk. There are times when the State must commandeer the individual or perish; and when they occur, one becomes somewhat impatient of theoretical rights and disquisitions on the proper ideals of the actions of a citizen.

When, however, we come to the past viewed in the cold light of history, we are able to judge more impartially the value of Mr. Laski's conclusions. Religion is the one force which really contests the claim of the State to absolute obedience; and there are times in which the issue is a straight one — when the individual has to choose between obeying God or man, the latter being represented by the State armed with visible power to coerce in case of disobedience. At times, of course, as at present in the case of those who have a conscientious objection to war, the individual is concerned; but Mr. Laski prefers to discuss the issue when religion is represented by the Church. Now the State, however high its claims, can never be a *societas perfecta* in the same sense as the Church. Even should it claim to exist by divine right, its ultimate end is human convenience, and as such it is liable to be modified or even destroyed. But that which deals with man's eternal welfare cannot submit to be tested by the same measure. It is an expression of the divine will and its claims are imperative. Hence from time to time the mutable State is bound to come in conflict with the unchangeable Church.

The first example of this is the famous Disruption in Scotland in 1843. When that country accepted the Reformation, it by no means rejected the Church. The Presbyterian government then set up was considered not as a compromise but as a new *societas perfecta* substituted for the old. The question arose in its acute form on the question of patronage as opposed to the choice of the congregation; and in the chapter devoted to it we have a masterly survey of the arguments for and against the claim of the Scottish Church for absolute independence of the State in things spiritual. The result is well known. Dr. Chalmers and his friends refused to submit to the judgment of the temporal courts, and, having counted the cost, nobly paid the penalty. They left the General Assembly, resigned their positions and emoluments, and, after facing the very real danger of utter poverty, founded the Free Church of Scotland. No one

can deny that such a defiance of the State was legitimate and in the same spirit as that shown by the early Christians towards the Roman Empire — obedience to all lawful commands of the State and resistance for conscience' sake combined with a readiness to pay the utmost penalty, without unmanly whines to be saved from it by a sympathetic public.

The Tractarians in the Oxford Movement were animated by a similar spirit. Macaulay had complained that the Disruptionists of the North had not sufficiently imbibed Whig principles; but this could not be urged against the average Churchman of the South. Superior in social prestige and wealth, the priests in high places in England were as a rule less conscious of the independence of their spiritual position than the presbyters of Scotland. They were, in fact, more ready to pay the price for their privileges by acknowledging the Whig doctrine that the function of the Church is to act the part of the servant of the State. As a reward they were treated with a contempt which culminated in the legislation which, in the case of the Irish bishoprics, ignored the last claims of ecclesiastical liberty to control the Church. Against this came the indignant protest of Keble, which kindled the latent Catholicism of the English clergy; with the result of the secession to Rome by Newman and his more enthusiastic admirers. The sequel is found in Mr. Laski's fourth chapter on "The Political Theory of the Catholic Revival," the main theme of which is the opposition of Lord John Russell, in whom the Whiggery of the Revolution was incarnate, to the Roman Catholic hierarchy set up in England under Cardinal Wiseman. This raised the whole question of the dual obligation of every Roman Catholic to obey the Pope and the King, and some of the best intellects of the time were engaged in the discussion. Of course the issue was the total discomfiture of Russell; nor have English Roman Catholics proved in any way inferior in loyalty to the mass of their countrymen.

In his last chapter Mr. Laski discusses the political theories of Le Maistre, the ultra Catholic, and Bismarck, the Protestant absolutist, and shows where they come to a certain agreement. From the survey of his wide field the author concludes in praise of federalism. "We begin to see the State as akin to the mediæval Empire, which was above all a community of communities." The analogy is not altogether happy, because the Empire was never a fact except on the rare occasions when it was centralized, nor was it a soil in which the tree of liberty was able to take deep roots. It is, however, with pleasure that we quote Mr. Laski's opening words: "This volume is

the first of a series of studies in which I hope to discuss the various aspects of the theory of the State." He has great problems before him, many of which are in the womb of the future. For centuries the Church has asserted its independence on purely ecclesiastical grounds — patronage in Scotland, ritual in England, the rights of the Pope in Rome. Will it ever stand for great and fundamental principles of righteousness? If it does, all previous strifes between Church and State, from Gregory VII to Pius X, will be dwarfed into insignificance. What about the other great communities — trade-unions and the like? But these things are on the knees of the gods; and we can leave the discussion of them with some confidence to Mr. Laski's future labors.

F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE. A Philosophical Essay. JOHN THEODORE MERZ. William Blackwood & Sons. 1915. Pp. xi, 192.

It would be strange indeed if the distinguished author of *A History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century* had not, in the course of his sympathetic study of the thoughts of others, been led to philosophical conclusions of his own. And it is only natural that one who has proved himself equally at home in the sciences, in philosophy, in sociology, and in theology, should focus his own reflections more particularly upon the problem of the relation of science and religion — a problem of which one may fairly say that, in one form or another, it has exercised every considerable modern thinker from the time of Descartes to the present day. Every one who is conscious of the debt we all owe to Dr. Merz for his *History* must welcome with sympathetic interest his contribution to the solution of this central problem of modern civilization. Dr. Merz's essay is written in simple, clear language, and distinguished by a serenity of outlook which bespeaks mastery of his subject and years of mature reflection. His manner of approach to the problem is, I think, unusual in discussions of this sort, and the effect is distinctly original. Dr. Merz describes his point of view as "psychological" and "introspective." It is very closely akin to what Avenarius calls the standpoint of "pure experience." Dr. Merz himself connects it, on the one hand, with Descartes' *Cogito ergo sum*, with Hume, and with the British Empiricists generally, and, on the other hand, with James's "stream of consciousness," that is, with the concept of primitive experience as a changing, flowing mass or continuum of sensations,

feelings, desires. The "firmament of the soul" is Dr. Merz's own picturesque name for it. Thus the problem formulates itself for Dr. Merz as tracing religion and science respectively to their roots in this "primordial" experience, which is also "primordial reality." The Positivist estimate of religion as antiquated superstition, destined to be supplanted by science, is hereby excluded at the very start. Religion has, so to speak, a metaphysical value. It is one of the ways in which we experience the real. It is a revelation of the real as well grounded as that of science, and less abstract, for it takes us back to the fundamental unity or "Together" of things, for which we need a "synoptic" apprehension. Thus Dr. Merz's method is to exhibit the abstractness of the scientific view of the world, and thereby to make room for attention to those sides of experience which science ignores but in which religion is rooted.

The great illusion (the term is not Dr. Merz's, but it represents, I think, the spirit of his argument) of science is the cosmic smallness and insignificance of experience. A man's experience, chaotic, fragmentary, a thing of fleeting shreds and patches, is even more transitory and unimportant than his own physical existence. Further, a man is only one among countless other units. His race is only one among animal species, and these constitute but a small and evanescent portion of terrestrial phenomena. Our earth itself is only a speck in a crowd of innumerable other worlds. Measured by the vast cosmic scale, human experience surely is but the tiniest and least important of by-products.

But take the "introspective" point of view and your metaphysical scale of values is promptly reversed. Then you realize that the "stream of consciousness" or the "firmament of the soul" contains, "as a very small portion only, those elementary sensations of sight, touch, and sound, out of which common sense builds up the external world, and science, with a still greater restriction of fundamental data, its edifice of methodical thought, its picture or model of the universe." The question is, which of those two points of view, the introspective or the scientific, gives us the "fuller amount of reality." "Each contains the other within its circumference, and is itself contained in the circumference of the other."

The choice, for Dr. Merz, is determined by the recognition that science, precisely because it abstracts, selects and analyzes, loses what their "synoptic" point of view enables artist and philosopher to retain and appreciate, namely, a sense of the whole or the All. This sense is the root of religion, especially in the form of the "feeling of absolute dependence" upon a "spiritual reality," the "pressure"

of which upon us we feel throughout the whole of our experience. Dr. Merz tries to show in a very interesting way how, just as the first "things" we learn to distinguish in the outer world are "persons," so this all-embracing reality must be conceived as personal, though freed from the limitations of finite persons. It manifests itself in us and through us, though never falling as a whole within the field of any single human mind.

Dr. Merz does not discuss specific religious doctrines. With the clash between scientific truths concerning human life and the dogmas of the virgin-birth, the resurrection, the ascension, he does not attempt to deal. His problem might be put in language adapted from Kant: How is religion possible? All who are interested in this problem will find his essay very suggestive, and will rise from their study of it with feelings of respect and appreciation.

R. F. ALFRED HOERNLÉ.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. Chronologically arranged. HARLAN CREELMAN and FRANK K. SANDERS. The Macmillan Co. 1917. Pp. xxxiv, 384. \$2.75.

In publishing this volume Professor Creelman has met a need which teachers of the Old Testament have long felt. We have a number of excellent Introductions to the Old Testament, varying all the way from such a brief handbook as that by G. F. Moore to Driver's standard work. In addition to these two those by McFadyen, Cornill, Kautzsch, Bennett, and Gray may especially be mentioned. But admirable as are these books, and leaving little to be desired in the way of exactness of scholarship, clearness of statement, and soundness and maturity of judgment, they do not meet the needs of the student who is looking for a detailed account of the chronological development of Old Testament literature and for a fair and impartial presentation of the divergent views still current in this field. These needs are met by Professor Creelman's new book.

The method followed by the author is to divide Old Testament history into a number of periods, and then discuss the historical sources for each of these periods and the literature belonging to it. The discussion of each period falls into two parts. First, there is a general introduction to the history and literature of the period, and then there is a detailed chronological outline of the Biblical material relating to it. In the first period, extending down to and including the conquest of Palestine, the structure and sources of the Hexa-

teuch are discussed, after which the Biblical material is analyzed and the question of its historicity dealt with in such a way as to give the student a clear grasp both of the contents of the Hexateuch and its probable historical value. In a similar way the history and literature of the period of the Judges, the United Kingdom, the Divided Kingdom, the Exile, and the Persian and Greek periods are treated. This method necessarily involves more or less of repetition. The historical writings, for instance, are considered both in connection with the period with which they deal and the period from which they emanated. The uncertainty also concerning the date of the Psalms and Proverbs makes it necessary to consider these books in several different periods. But this repetition is no drawback from the pedagogical point of view. It rather enhances the value of the work as a text-book.

The position of the authors is in the main that represented by Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. It is moderately conservative without being dogmatic in its conclusions. Divergent views are freely recorded, and the reader is furnished with extensive references to current English Old Testament literature. No claim to originality is made. The authors' purpose is "to incorporate and make available the results of the best modern scholarship in such form as, it is hoped, will be helpful to intelligent Old Testament study," and in this aim they have admirably succeeded. The book is a painstaking, thorough, and reliable work, the outcome of many years of labor and experience. In its method of treatment and to some extent in its contents it is a valuable supplement to the other Old Testament Introductions, and as a student's manual it has distinct advantages of its own.

ALBERT C. KNUDSON.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY.

HISTORY OF THE SPANISH CONQUEST OF YUCATAN AND OF THE ITZAS.

PHILIP AINSWORTH MEANS. Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University. Vol. VII. Cambridge. 1917. Pp. xv, 206. Plates 1-6.

In the great collection of photographic copies of manuscripts relating to Central America, given to the Peabody Museum by Mr. Charles P. Bowditch, is an account of the missionary Avendaño's journey to Peten in northern Guatemala, at the end of the seventeenth century. Taking this unpublished journal (which had been translated by Mr. Bowditch and Señor Rivera) as a foundation, the author has added data derived from an unpublished account by Cano (in

the possession of the University of Pennsylvania) and other sources, and written an account of the progress of the Spanish conquest of Yucatan and the adjacent region from its beginning in 1517 to the complete subjection of the Itzas of Peten in 1696. A vocabulary of the Itza dialect, a list of the early maps of Yucatan, and a bibliography are given in appendices.

A brief introductory chapter presents an outline of the pre-Columbian history of the Maya people, of whom the Itzas were a branch. In this Mr. Means follows Morley's chronology. The story of the conquest itself begins with Cortez's famous overland expedition to Honduras in 1524, in which Europeans for the first time penetrated to Peten. Little came of this early contact, however, and for years the attention of the Spaniards was concentrated on northern Yucatan. About the beginning of the seventeenth century interest was again awakened in the Itza country, and the first missionaries penetrated to Peten. After a brief period of apparent success for their efforts, the Itzas revolted and apostatized, and nearly eighty years then passed before the final subjection of this warlike group.

The account of Avendaño deals with the period just prior to this final pacification, and his two *entradas* are given at considerable length. The first attempt of the intrepid missionary failed, but on the second he succeeded in reaching Peten, only to be obliged to flee for his life on account of the treachery of the people. After terrible privations, during which he almost perished of starvation, he at last returned to Merida in safety. Ursua, the governor of Yucatan, then determined to put an end to the unbearable situation, and led a well-equipped force to Peten, where he decisively defeated the Itzas.

Such in outline is the story told by Mr. Means, largely in the words of eye-witnesses. His work seems to have been carefully done, but the use of the term "race" in speaking of the Itzas and Mayas as "two separate races," is inexcusable; and the suggestion of plagiarism on the part of Villagutierre put forward in the Introduction seems to rest on rather slender evidence. In correlating the various accounts of the conquest and presenting the whole story in connected form, Mr. Means has done Maya students a real service. Yet, after all, the chief value of his paper lies in making accessible the hitherto unpublished journals of Avenaño.

ROLAND B. DIXON.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.